

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1338646

The John C. Rea Library



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

Christianity and Industry: One

INDUSTRIAL FACTS

CONCRETE DATA
CONCERNING INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS
AND PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

BY
KIRBY PAGE

BR
115
E3
C54
no. 1-7

NEW  YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

Ten Cents Net.

THE
BIBLICAL
THEOL.

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

COPYRIGHT, 1921,
BY GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY



PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS:

	PAGE
WORLD-WIDE UNREST	5
CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH AND CONTROL	6
EXTENT OF POVERTY	8
LOW WAGES	8
UNEMPLOYMENT	11
LONG HOURS	11
SUMMARY	12

PROPOSED SOLUTIONS:

INCREASED PRODUCTION	13
WELFARE WORK	14
EMPLOYEES' REPRESENTATION	15
THE EMPLOYERS' OPEN SHOP CAMPAIGN	16
TRADE UNIONS	18
THE COÖPERATIVE MOVEMENT	20
LABOR PARTY	21
SOCIALISM	23
SYNDICALISM	24
NATIONAL GUILD MOVEMENT	25
CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES	26
NEXT STEPS	29

APPENDICES:

THE COLLEGIATE INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH MOVEMENT	30
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY ON CURRENT PROBLEMS	31

AUTHOR'S NOTE

In a brief pamphlet it is manifestly impossible to discuss in an exhaustive manner all of our industrial problems and the proposed solutions. The purpose of this pamphlet is simply to direct attention to certain major facts and to point out present tendencies. Great care has been used in assembling the facts quoted herein. Before this manuscript was sent to the press, it was read carefully by five or six competent authorities of national note. If, however, there are any misstatements of fact herein, the present writer would greatly appreciate having his attention called to the same. Communications may be addressed to him in care of the publishers.

June 1st, 1921.

INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS

WORLD-WIDE UNREST

The peoples of the earth are in commotion. From every quarter we hear of industrial strife, war, revolution and widespread unrest. Nation is arrayed against nation, class against class. What the future holds no one can tell. Mr. Frank H. Simonds, the eminent newspaper correspondent, says: "It seems to me about an even thing whether Europe can be saved or will sink into anarchy and chaos." Mr. H. N. Brailsford, the famous journalist, says: "The fact that confronts us is world shortage, the dwindling of populations, the decay of industries, the twilight of civilizations."

The full tide of unrest has not as yet reached America. It may be a decade removed. But it is on its way. Let there be no mistake about that. Rumblings are audible even now. Irritability and bitterness in industrial relations are increasing. Mr. Roger W. Babson reminds us that "we are in a most critical period. Unless both employers and wage earners quickly come to their senses, we shall witness the greatest industrial and financial panic which this country has ever experienced." Something is the matter with our present social order. This is an indisputable fact

Of the many efforts now being made to diagnose the ills of society, few are more significant and stimulating than the analysis of Mr. R. H. Tawney, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, in his little book, "The Acquisitive Society." The main trouble, in the opinion of Mr. Tawney, is that at present we have a society in which *rights and privileges* are supreme, and in which *functions and obligations* are only secondary. In such a society the chief concern of individuals is the acquisition of wealth and power. The individual becomes "the center of his own universe."

Mr. Tawney points out that there are two noteworthy consequences of such a conception. The first is the creation of a class, the strong and successful in the general scramble for wealth, who in time are able to levy a toll upon industry and live from the toil of the weak and unsuccessful. "The second consequence is the degradation of those who labor." Those who are compelled to

labor are deemed inferior to those who are able to live luxuriously without labor. "Wealth becomes the foundation of public esteem."

As a substitute for such a social order, Mr. Tawney would have a society in which *functions* are supreme, in which there would be no right without a corresponding function, no privilege without a corresponding obligation. In such a society wealth and remuneration would be based upon service for the common good, "not upon chance or privilege or the power to use opportunities to drive a hard bargain." The chief honors and choicest rewards would go to those who do the most for the common welfare, and not, as is often the case in our present society, to those who labor not at all and who contribute only meagerly and indirectly to the common good. "If society is to be healthy," says Mr. Tawney, "men must regard themselves not as the owners of rights, but as trustees for the discharge of functions and the instruments of social purpose."¹

CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH AND CONTROL

The conclusion of Mr. Tawney that in an acquisitive society there is a tendency to create a class which lives without labor and to degrade those who do labor is verified by an examination of the actual facts in the United States.

Here we have an increasing congestion of wealth and power. We are told by Professor W. I. King that "two per cent of the population owns sixty per cent of the wealth," and that at the other end of the scale, "the poorest two-thirds of the people own but a petty five or six per cent of the wealth."²

The Congressional investigation of the "Money Trust" in 1912 brought out the fact that "one hundred and eighty men have a controlling influence over capital far in excess of one-fourth of the wealth of America."³ Professor Sims tells us that "some 1,600 directorships in 100 of the leading railway and other industrial and money corporations are in the hands of 76 men. One man is on the board of 45 railroad companies."⁴

Mr. Louis D. Brandeis, now Justice of the Supreme Court, reminds us that the Pujo Committee found that the members of J. P. Morgan & Co. and the directors of their controlled trust companies, and of the First National and the National City Bank together hold, in all, 341 directorships in 112 corporations—banks,

¹ R. H. Tawney, "The Acquisitive Society," p. 51. This little book deserves careful reading by every student of social problems.

² W. I. King, "Wealth and Income," pp. 80, 82.

³ Quoted in U. L. Sims, "Ultimate Democracy," p. 52 (1917).

⁴ Sims, *Ibid.*, p. 51.

trust companies, insurance companies, transportation systems, producing and trading corporations, and public utilities—having aggregate resources or capitalization of \$22,245,000,000.¹ We are then reminded that this sum of twenty-two billion dollars “is more than twice the assessed value of all the property in the thirteen Southern States. It is more than the assessed value of all the property in the twenty-two states, north and south, lying west of the Mississippi River.”

The report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of March 25, 1919, shows that there are, in round numbers, some 600,000 stockholders in the first-class railroads, which roads represent 97 per cent of the traffic of the country. This report shows that the majority of the stock in each one of those roads is held by less than 20 of the big stockholders in each road. The report also shows that less than 1.3 per cent of the stockholders of first class roads control the stock. Commenting upon this report, Senator LaFollette points out that “the real power which to-day controls the railroads of the United States is the group of a dozen New York financial institutions. This group of 12 New York banks holds 267 railroad directorships on 92 class 1 railroads. With their subsidiary branch lines, these railroads constitute to all intents and purposes the transportation system of the United States.”²

Concerning the concentration in land ownership, Professor Sims says: “The 1910 census revealed the fact that about one-fourth of the agricultural land in the United States was in the possession of about six ten-thousandths (only a fraction of 1 per cent) of the population. There were many estates of millions of acres. Fifty-four owners had, it is said, nearly 27,000,000 acres.”³

We are told by Mr. Louis F. Post, formerly Assistant Secretary of Labor, that “in Florida three holders had 4,200,000 acres of land, and the largest timber holders of Florida appear to hold over 16,990,000 acres, about one-eighth of the land area of the state.”⁴ President Van Hise says that a few years ago 658 holders monopolized more than 61 per cent of all the standing timber in the United States.”⁵

The story could easily be continued through several chapters. Concentration and tendency toward monopoly are the order of the day. Money, credit, land, timber, minerals, railways, public

¹ Quoted in Lionel D. Edie, “Current Social and Industrial Forces,” p. 125 (1920).

² In the U. S. Senate, February 21, 1921, recorded in the Congressional Record, March 14, 1921, pp. 4779-4781.

³ N. L. Sims, “Ultimate Democracy,” p. 49 (1917).

⁴ *The Public*, June 7, 1919.

⁵ C. R. Van Hise, “Concentration and Control,” p. 156 (1912).

INDUSTRIAL FACTS

utilities, the packing industry, food products, and other vital industries have been increasingly concentrated in the hands of the few.

EXTENT OF POVERTY

By way of contrast with the enormous wealth of the favored few, let us note the extent of poverty among the masses. Mr. John Simpson Penman, in his book on poverty, tells us that "it would be a conservative estimate to say that there are two million families living below the fair standard. That would mean that about ten million persons are living in poverty, or at the margin of the minimum standard of existence."¹

Professor Maurice Parmelee says: "We have plenty of evidence that the number of those who do not even reach the lower minimum standard of living is very great, probably exceeding ten per cent of the population."² Dr. Edward T. Devine reminds us that "the difference between the misery of the Inferno and the misery of New York is not so much one of degree. Men and women and children here suffer, if not so much as in hell, at least to the full limit of their human capacity. It is not in its diversity. There are more kinds of misery in New York than Milton ever dreamed of in his blindness."

LOW WAGES

Not only is it true that millions of our people are living in actual poverty, a large proportion of our total population receive an income insufficient to enable them to maintain a decent or comfortable standard of living. The figures are easily obtained from the income tax returns. The latest statistics published are those for 1918. The total number of personal income tax returns for 1918 was 4,425,114.³ Of these only 2,908,176 received an annual income of \$2,000, and only 1,411,298 received an annual income of \$3,000. If we multiply these figures by five, the size of the average American family—father, mother and three children under fourteen—we discover that less than 15 per cent of the families received a net income of \$2,000 and less than 7 per cent received a net income of \$3,000. These figures will appear all the more significant when it is recalled that the average increase in cost of living in 1918 over 1914 was approximately 75 per cent.

¹ John Simpson Penman, M.A., "Poverty the Challenge to the Church," pp. 26, 27 (1915).

² Maurice Parmelee, Ph.D., "Poverty and Social Progress," pp. 105, 106 (1916).

³ Treasury Department, U. S. Internal Revenue Statistics of Income Compiled from the Returns for 1918, published in 1921.

The Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations states that "it is certain that at least one-third and possibly one-half of the families of wage earners employed in manufacturing and mining earn in the course of the year less than enough to support them in anything like a comfortable and decent condition."¹

There is a widespread belief that war-time raises in wages have rendered obsolete such reports as this one. Let us get at the facts in the case. Let us first consider the rapid increase in the cost of living. Careful estimates along this line have been made by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, the National Industrial Conference Board, the Massachusetts Commission on the Necessaries of Life, and other agencies. There is general agreement that the increase in cost of living in 1920 over 1914 was at least 96 or 97 per cent.

In 1917 an official board of arbitration in the Seattle and Tacoma Street Railways dispute set \$1,505.60 as a minimum family budget—father, mother and three children under fourteen. In 1918 Professor W. F. Ogburn prepared a minimum family budget for the War Labor Board. He set the minimum figure at \$1,760.50. In December, 1919, Professor Ogburn prepared a budget for the bituminous coal mine workers. This minimum budget was set at \$2,143.94. In August, 1919, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics made a careful estimate of the amount needed to maintain a family of five in health and decency in the city of Washington. At the market prices then prevailing this minimum budget was set at \$2,262.47. Prices continued to rise throughout the early months of 1920.

Now let us get at the facts as to the wages of workmen during this period of excessively high cost of living. Large numbers of people are convinced that railroad employees are now receiving exorbitant wages. The United States Railroad Labor Board has published the figures for 1,828,772 railroad employees.² The passenger engineers are the highest paid group. The United States Railroad Labor Board award of July, 1920, raised the wages of these engineers to an average monthly rate of \$288.82, or \$3,465.84 annually. The number of engineers receiving this rate was 12,350, or less than 1 per cent of the total number of employees. The number of railroad employees receiving as much as \$200 a month, or \$2,400 annually, was 171,025, or slightly more than 9 per cent of the total number. Among the clerical and

¹ Senate Document No. 415, 64th Congress, August 23, 1915, p. 22.

² United States Railroad Labor Board, Wage Series, Report No. 1, August, 1920. These average rates do not take into account periods of unemployment or overtime work.

station forces, maintenance of way and unskilled labor forces, a total of 940,025 employees, or just half of the total number, received less than \$122 a month, or \$1,464 annually. Of these, 275,352 section men, or 15 per cent of the total number of employees, received less than \$95 per month, or \$1,140 a year. A vigorous effort is now being made by the railroad managers to reduce the wages of their employees, in spite of the fact that from a quarter to a half million of them now receive an income insufficient to enable them to maintain a decent standard of living.

Another instance of high wages paid to skilled workmen is found in the steel industry, where a few skilled men earn from \$13.52 to \$32.56 a day, one man receiving this highest wage. The list of these highly skilled and highly paid men constitutes a fraction of 1 per cent of all employees. According to the Inter-church Report of the Steel Strike of 1919, "The annual earnings of over one-third of all productive iron and steel workers were, and had been for years, below the level set by government experts as the minimum *subsistence* standard for families of five. The annual earnings of 72 per cent of all workers were, and had been for years, below the level set by government experts as the *minimum of comfort* level for families of five. This second standard being the lowest which scientists are willing to term an 'American standard of living,' it follows that nearly three-quarters of the steel workers could not earn enough for an American standard of living." ¹

Women's wages are even less adequate. In the survey made by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1919, of the 85,812 women employed in the 28 industries included in the survey, the average weekly wage was \$13.54. Approximately 21 per cent received less than \$11.00 per week, and approximately 15 per cent received less than \$10.00 per week.² A survey made by the Council of National Defence and Minnesota Bureau of Women and Children revealed that "17,459 women workers out of a total of 51,361, or 34.05 per cent, received less than a minimum subsistence wage."³ From the Tenth Biennial Report of the Department of Commissioner of Labor and Industrial Statistics of Louisiana, 1919-1920, we learn that of the 10,877 women employed in the department stores, offices and hotels investigated, 7,310, or 67 per cent, received less than \$7 per week.⁴

¹ "Report on the Steel Strike of 1919," p. 85.

² U. S. Dept. of Labor—Bureau of Labor Statistics—Bulletin 265.

³ Quoted in District of Columbia Minimum Wage Cases brief filed by Felix Frankfurter, p. 338.

⁴ Quoted in District of Columbia Minimum Wage Cases, brief filed by Felix Frankfurter. p. 348 (1920).

UNEMPLOYMENT

The facts in the case clearly indicate that vast numbers of men and women employed in industry receive less than a living wage. The situation is more serious than is revealed by this statement. Even in normal times hundreds of thousands of men and women are unable to find employment. This fact is emphasized in a report made in 1917 by Mr. Hornell H. Hart for the Helen S. Trousstine Foundation: "The number of unemployed in cities of the United States (entirely omitting agricultural labor, for which no reliable data are now available) has fluctuated between 1,000,000 and 6,000,000. The least unemployment occurred in 1906-1907 and in 1916-1917, while the most occurred in 1908 and in 1914 and 1915. The average number of unemployed has been two and a half million workers, or nearly ten per cent of the active supply."¹ The final report of the Commission on Industrial Relations informs us that "wage earners in the principal manufacturing and mining industries in the United States lose on the average from one-fifth to one-fourth of the working time during the normal year."² Government estimates of the extent of unemployment in the United States at the beginning of 1921 varied from 3,500,000 to 4,000,000.³

LONG HOURS

While hundreds of thousands of men are seeking in vain for employment, other thousands of men are working twelve hours per day. Concerning the twelve-hour day in the steel industry, the Interchurch Report on the Steel Strike of 1919 says: "Approximately half of the employees in iron and steel manufacturing plants are subject to the schedule known as the twelve-hour day (that is a working day from 11 to 14 hours long). Less than one-quarter of the industry's employees can work under 60 hours a week."⁴ The United States Steel Corporation has recently announced its intention of abolishing the seven-day week and of reducing the hours of the working day. It is only a question of time until it will be compelled by public opinion to abolish the twelve-hour day.

In a report made for the Charles M. Cabot Fund, published

¹ Hornell H. Hart, "Fluctuations in Employment in Cities of the U. S., 1902-1917."

² Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations, Senate Document No. 415, 64th Congress, p. 103.

³ *New York World*, January 27, 1921.

⁴ Report on the Steel Strike of 1919, pp. 44, 45.

in the *Survey* for March 5, 1921, Mr. John A. Fitch states that over 65 per cent of the workmen employed by the Carnegie Steel Company work the twelve-hour day. Mr. Herbert Hoover recently remarked that the twelve-hour day "transgresses to a point of inhumanity."

SUMMARY

Thus far we have enumerated as causes of unrest and strife the following: We have an acquisitive society, in which rights and privileges take precedence over functions and obligations; in which there is an excessive inequality of wealth and income, the few possessing an overabundance while many are poor and destitute; in which a large proportion of workmen are unable to earn an income sufficient to maintain a decent or comfortable standard of living; in which hundreds of thousands of workmen are unable, through no fault of their own, to obtain employment, while at the same time other thousands are compelled to work the twelve-hour day. To these evils we could add such others as: the overemphasis upon competition and the depreciation of coöperation; inefficiency, due to lack of training or to personal defects in character; suppression and intimidation, through control of the press and platform and through labor spies and under-cover men.¹

There are, of course, a multitude of other contributory factors to unrest and strife. Perhaps the ones we have mentioned are sufficient to justify the conclusion that there are grave defects in our present social order, which if neglected will surely bring disorder and disaster.

¹ See "The Labor Spy," by Sidney Howard, published by the New Republic, 421 West 21st Street, New York, price 15 cents. A 72-page pamphlet containing startling facts concerning industrial espionage.

PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

Various groups of men and women are earnestly seeking the solution of our many industrial problems. They are approaching the problem from different angles and have different suggestions to offer. This is fortunate. The whole problem is so complex that it is futile to anticipate the discovery of a panacea by means of which all of our social ills may be cured. We should, therefore, consider sympathetically any proposal advanced as a possible contribution toward the solving of our complex industrial problems. Let us now examine very briefly a number of the proposed remedies.

INCREASED PRODUCTION

The group known as industrial engineers is preaching a gospel of maximum production of goods with the minimum expenditure of energy. They point out that at present industry is highly inefficient and wasteful. Concerning conditions during even the war-time rush of 1918, Mr. H. L. Gantt, an expert engineer, said: "On the whole, only about 50 per cent of our industrial machines are actually operating during the time they are expected to operate; and on the whole these machines, during the time they are being operated, are producing only about 50 per cent of what they are expected to produce. This brings our productive result down to about one-fourth of what it might be if the machines were run all the time at their highest capacity."¹

Mr. John Leitch expresses the opinion that "we have not, during the past ten or fifteen years, secured more than 40 per cent of our labor efficiency; that is, we have wasted probably 60 per cent of our manufacturing capacity."²

Writing in the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, for May, 1915, Mr. J. Russell Smith said: "It is not difficult to figure up a total possibility of 300 to 400 per cent easy increase in the national production by the general application of methods now well known and practiced by thousands."

¹ Quoted in Lionel D. Edie, "Current Social and Industrial Forces," p. 32.

² John Leitch, "Man-to-Man," p. 17.

The industrial engineers are striving to make this potential increase in production a reality. They have a valuable contribution to make toward solving our social and industrial problems.

WELFARE WORK

A large group of employers seeks to overcome unrest and strife by improving working conditions. This is a commendable spirit. Much needs to be done along this line. Large numbers of workmen are constantly exposed to danger from accidents and industrial poisons. Mr. Frederick L. Hoffman, of the Prudential Life Insurance Co., estimates that approximately 25,000 wage-earners are killed in our industries each year, and that about 700,000 are disabled for a period of more than four weeks.¹

The United States Steel Corporation has set a commendable example in providing for the safety of its employees. Mr. C. W. Price, General Manager of the National Safety Council, estimates that this corporation has reduced the number of deaths in its plants from accidents approximately 80 per cent.²

There can be no doubt that by means of the various forms of welfare work promoted by different employers, the working conditions of large numbers of employees have been greatly improved. Those employers who have led the way are entitled to credit and praise.

Two objections are often raised with regard to welfare work. The first is that the whole scheme is often paternalistic. The employees usually have little voice in determining such matters for themselves. All they have to do is to take advantage of the privileges offered them. The second objection is more serious. It is contended that some employers undertake welfare work simply as a means of combating labor unions and industrial democracy. It is even said that certain corporations use welfare work as a means of diverting public attention from other highly undesirable practices, such as low wages, long hours and industrial autocracy.

Genuine welfare work does have a contribution to make toward the solving of our industrial problems. Paternalism is not so good as democracy, but the benevolent employer surely is an improvement over the one who is unconcerned as to the welfare of his employees. Public opinion, however, should never allow

¹ F. L. Hoffman, "Industrial Accidents," p. 44.

² Quoted in *Literary Digest*, April 17, 1920, p. 46. The United States Steel Corporation, 71 Broadway, New York, will send upon request a booklet, "Welfare Work in the Steel Industry," by Charles L. Close. Bulletin No. 250 of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics describes various kinds of welfare work now being undertaken.

welfare work to become a cloak to cover vicious practices on the part of employers.

EMPLOYEES' REPRESENTATION

Many employers are recognizing the advisability of granting their employees a larger share in determining working conditions. A host of experiments are now being made in this realm. One of these is the plan inaugurated by Mr. John Leitch.¹ This scheme provides for a form of industrial government patterned after our Federal Government, with a Cabinet, a Senate and a House of Representatives. The International Harvester Company has an Industrial Council, composed half of representatives of the employees and half appointed by the managers, with provision for the selection of neutral arbitrators when required. This Council has full power in the matter of wages, hours and conditions of work.²

The Colorado Fuel and Iron Company has been successful with its plan of employees' representation.³ Proctor & Gamble, of Cincinnati, have elected three of their employees to membership upon their Board of Directors. The Dutchess Bleachery, Wappingers Falls, New York, Wm. Filene & Sons of Boston, the Dennison Manufacturing Company of Framingham, Massachusetts, and many other employers have achieved marked success with various forms of employees' representation.⁴

Messrs. Hart, Schaffner & Marx have been pioneers in this field and have achieved remarkable results through their Labor Agreement. This agreement is reached through collective bargaining directly with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, an unusually strong labor union, and covers a wide scope, including rates of pay, hours, preference in hiring, discipline, discharge of workers. The larger measure of government in industry achieved has been highly satisfactory both to the company and to the employees. This experiment deserves careful study by all students of industrial problems.⁵

¹ This plan is fully described in his book, "Man-to-Man."

² A pamphlet, "The Harvester Industrial Council," describing this plan may be secured from the International Harvester Co., Chicago, Ill.

³ This scheme is described in a pamphlet by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., called "The Colorado Industrial Plan." Copies may be secured from Mr. Rockefeller, 26 Broadway, New York City.

⁴ The Bureau of Industrial Research, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York City, has issued a 38-page pamphlet, called "American Company Shop Committee Plans," which contains a digest of twenty plans of employees' representation. Price \$1.00.

⁵ Mr. Earl Dean Howard, Director of Labor for Hart, Schaffner & Marx, has issued a 97-page book called "Industrial Law in the Clothing Industry," describing the plan in full. Copies may be secured from Hart, Schaffner & Marx, Chicago, Illinois.

All genuine experiments with employees' representation should be encouraged. Undoubtedly real progress is being made along this line. There is a widespread feeling, however, that some employers are using "company unions" and bogus schemes of employees' representation as weapons with which to destroy effective combinations of workmen and to forestall genuine democracy in industry. Public opinion should give credit where it is due, but should not be deceived by insincere schemes of employees' representation.

THE EMPLOYERS' OPEN SHOP CAMPAIGN

An important group of men, chiefly employers, is convinced that much of the present trouble is due to labor agitators and dictation by labor unions. This group seeks to eliminate these disturbers and improve conditions by means of the open shop. As they define it, an open shop is one in which "no persons shall be refused employment or in any way discriminated against on account of membership or non-membership in any labor organization."¹

The theory of the employers' open shop is that no discrimination shall be made against any man because of membership or non-membership in a labor union. As a matter of fact, however, some employers are using the open shop as a weapon against union men and are seeking, usually secretly, to destroy the power of labor unions.

Concerning the testimony presented before the Lockwood Committee in New York City, Mr. John A. Fitch says: "Throughout the testimony it was evident that the kind of open shop that the steel corporations are attempting to enforce in the building trades of New York and Philadelphia is one where union men cannot get a job, and the way in which this kind of open shop is maintained is through organization of the industry and the exercise of coercion."²

In theory many employers grant the right of men to organize in unions, in practice many of these men are seeking vigorously to make the unions weak and ineffective. The attitude of many employers is well described by Ray Stannard Baker: "Yes, we believe in unionism, but damn the unions."

¹ For a defence of the open shop campaign see the "Debater's Handbook," issued by the National Association of Manufacturers, 30 Church Street, New York City. The opposite point of view is presented in "The Open Shop Drive" by Savel Zimand, published by the Bureau of Industrial Research, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York City. Price 50 cents, students 25 cents.

² *Survey*, January 1, 1921.

Ex-President Taft has expressed his opinion of such a practice in the following words: "It is the custom of Bourbon employers engaged in fighting labor unionism to the death to call a closed non-union shop an open shop and to call the movement to kill unionism an open-shop movement. This is a deceitful misuse of the term."¹

The Committee on Industrial Relations, of the Merchants' Association of New York, recently submitted a report in which the following comment was made upon the present open-shop drive: "Your Committee deploras the disposition on the part of some employers who are using the term 'open shop' to work toward a condition of the closed non-union shop by discriminating against union men. It likewise regrets that the operation of the closed union shop frequently results in restriction of output and limitation of available labor supply."²

Concerning those employers who say they have no objection to their employees joining labor unions but who refuse to recognize or deal with the unions, the National Catholic Welfare Council has this to say: "Of what avail is it for workers to be permitted by the employers to become members of unions if the employers will not deal with unions? The workers might as well join golf clubs as labor unions if the present 'open shop' campaign is successful. The 'open shop' drive masks under such names as 'The American Plan' and hides behind the pretense of American freedom. Yet its real purpose is to destroy all effective labor unions, and thus subject the working people to the complete domination of the employers."³

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has issued a statement in which it is declared that: "The relations between employers and workers throughout the United States are seriously affected at this moment by a campaign which is being conducted for the open shop policy—the so-called American Plan of Employment. These terms are now being frequently used to designate establishments that are definitely anti-union. Obviously, a shop of this kind is not an open shop but a closed shop—closed against members of labor unions."⁴

The real open shop is one thing, the present agitation often involves quite a different thing. *The real issue is that of collective bargaining*, the willingness of employers to deal with representatives chosen by organized groups of workmen. Without the right

¹ Quoted in *The Baltimore News*, February 5, 1921.

² Quoted in the *Information Service*, of the Research Department of the Federal Council of Churches, April 1, 1921, p. 6.

³ Quoted in "The Open Shop Drive," pp. 45, 46.

⁴ *Ibid.*

and ability to bargain collectively, workmen are at the mercy of employers. Employers are organized. Their associations are enormously powerful. An individual employer does not usually stand alone in his struggle against his own employees. This fact is brought out in the statement of principles of the American Employers' Association, in which it is stated: "In the event of a strike or similar trouble, financial support should be given to the one afflicted and also moral support. This is an important factor in the hour of trouble."¹

The necessity of national organizations of workmen was emphasized by Mr. Louis D. Brandeis, now Justice of the Supreme Court, in his testimony before the Industrial Relations Commission: "To suggest that labor unions can be effective if organized on less than a national scale seems to ignore entirely the facts and trend of present-day American business."²

Concerning the right of workmen to organize and to bargain collectively, the United States Senate Committee on the Steel Strike said: "The Committee is agreed that the principle of collective bargaining is a right of men working in industry."³ In the principles of the War Labor Board it is stated: "The right of workers to organize in trade unions and to bargain collectively through chosen representatives is recognized and affirmed. This right shall not be denied, abridged, or interfered with by the employers in any manner whatsoever."⁴ Mr. Herbert Hoover expresses the opinion that "the attitude of refusal to participate in collective bargaining with representatives of the employees' own choosing, is the negation of the bridge to better relationship."⁵

The present open shop campaign offers no solution of our industrial problems. As ex-President Taft says: "The principle of combination among workmen is indispensable to their welfare and their protection against the tyranny of employers. But if the employers are now to unite in an effort by closed non-union shops to suppress labor unions in hard times and to establish a bulwark against their revival when demand for labor returns, they are attempting the unwise, the unjust and the impossible."⁶

TRADE UNIONS

Large groups of workmen have become convinced that organization is their only escape from tyranny and injustice. The

¹ Quoted in the *American Federationist*, February, 1921.

² "Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations," p. 65.

³ U. S. Senate Committee on "Investigation of Strike in Steel Industries," Nov. 8, 1919, 66th Congress, Report No. 289.

⁴ Quoted in "The Open Shop Drive," p. 10.

⁵ Quoted in John A. Ryan, "Capital and Labor," p. 9.

⁶ Quoted in *The Baltimore News*, February 5, 1921.

validity of this conclusion is generally recognized. As long as they remain unorganized, workmen are at the mercy of employers.

The American trade union movement dates from the end of the 18th century. National organizations of workmen came into existence about the middle of the last century. In 1886 the American Federation of Labor was organized by "delegates from twenty-five organizations, representing a membership of 316,469." "In 1919 the Federation embraced 111 national and international unions, 46 state federations, 816 central city bodies, and 33,852 local unions."¹ Not included in the Federation are the powerful Railway Brotherhoods, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and other strong unions.

The American Federation of Labor is a conservative organization. It has never sought to overthrow the present social order. It has frankly accepted capitalistic production and has devoted its energies almost entirely to the task of obtaining for its members higher wages, shorter hours and improved working conditions.

The organized trade union movement has undoubtedly been instrumental in raising wages, reducing hours and improving working conditions, not only for union men but for great masses of unorganized workmen as well. Unfortunately, however, the trade unions in America have conspicuous weakness. They have often been notoriously weak in leadership. Some of their walking delegates and officials have been notoriously corrupt. Not all of this sort have been sent to jail. On too many occasions trade unions have broken their contracts. They have often been guilty of deliberate limitation of output. They have occasionally advocated the closed-union in a closed-shop, thus limiting the number of workmen who might engage in a given industry. Another weakness is to be found in the lack of an adequate educational program for union members.

In spite of the serious weaknesses and faults of trade unions, the organized labor movement deserves the hearty support of workmen and all others who desire the establishment of such conditions as will promote industrial peace and prosperity. As Roger Babson reminds us, organized labor is now in its adolescence and liable to all the excesses of youth. Organized labor, however, is imperatively needed to resist the tyranny of privileged classes.

There are indications that many labor leaders are now recognizing the weaknesses and limitations of the trade union movement. A new emphasis is now being placed upon an adequate educational program. Various experiments in workers' education are being

¹ Mary Beard, "A Short History of the American Labor Movement," p. 98. This book is perhaps the best brief history of the American labor movement.

made by trade unions, especially in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Boston, Seattle, Cleveland and Washington. This deeper interest in education is exceedingly significant and holds great promise for the future.¹

Many trade union leaders are seeking to promote more cordial relations with the so-called brain workers, and desire to see them welcomed into the ranks of organized labor. This is encouraging. Workers by hand and workers by brain can supplement each other. Strenuous efforts should be put forth to promote harmonious relations and effective coöperation between these two groups.

With better leadership and higher ideals, the trade union movement has an enormously important contribution to make toward the solving of our industrial problems.

THE COÖPERATIVE MOVEMENT

The trade union movement is an organization of producers. The coöperative movement is an organization of consumers. The purpose of the coöperative movement is to organize consumers so that through coöperative buying they may be able to avoid exploitation at the hands of manufacturers and distributors. It seeks to eliminate middlemen and to aid the consumer in purchasing direct from the manufacturer or grower, and to own its factories and acreage.

The coöperative movement now exists in almost all countries of the world. Dr. James Peter Warbasse tells us that "in Europe it now embraces one-third of the population, and carries on every form of useful industry; some of these are the largest of their kind. In some countries a majority of the people are included in the coöperative movement. The organized societies in each country are federated in the world movement through the International Coöperative Alliance."

In England especially the movement has assumed huge dimensions. There are now 1,467 societies, with 4,182,019 members, with annual sales for the factories, wholesale and retail stores, of approximately \$1,500,000 (£324,781,079), with a capital of approximately \$450,000,000 (£98,801,231), with an annual net surplus of approximately \$100,000,000 (£21,809,563) to be divided among the members, with 187,535 employees.²

¹ See Arthur Gleason's "Workers' Education," a 64-page pamphlet published by the Bureau of Industrial Research, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York City. Price 50 cents, to trade union members and students 25 cents.

² *The People's Year Book* (1921), p. 49. This book contains valuable information and statistics concerning coöperation, labor and allied subjects. Price 75 cents.

From the *British Labour Year Book* of 1919 we learn that "the Wholesale Societies now own 17,519 acres of tea plantations in Ceylon and Southern India, and in 1917, the English C. W. S. bought 10,000 acres of wheat lands in Canada, concessions on the West Coast of Africa and in Nigeria; several farms at home, making it the owner of 12,400 acres in the counties of Lancashire, Yorkshire, Cambridge, Herefordshire, Cheshire, and Shropshire; it also acquired several textile mills, bought a colliery, and started a margarine works."

The movement in the United States has grown rapidly within recent years, especially among farmers and trade union members. There are now more than 3,000 coöperative stores in the United States.¹ The idea behind the coöperative movement is fundamentally sound. Coöperative buying is certain to increase. This movement deserves careful study and earnest support. It has an important contribution to make.

LABOR PARTY

There is an increasing conviction on the part of many persons that organized labor should enter politics with an independent party. Those who hold this view point out that both of the regular political parties are under the domination of financiers and business men, that there is little difference in their policies and programs, and that the masses can never hope to secure justice without independent action.

Organized labor in England has had an independent political party since 1893, when the Independent Labour Party was founded. In 1899-1900 the Labour Party was formed and in 1906 29 labour representatives were returned to Parliament. In 1919 the Labour Party had an affiliated membership of 3,511,290,² and this number has been greatly increased since that time. At the General Election of December 14, 1918, 62 representatives of the Labour Party were elected to Parliament. Labor candidates have been successful in a number of by-elections since that time. It is freely predicted that a Labour Government will come into power in England within the next decade.

The main policies of the British Labour Party are embodied in a report issued in 1918 under the title, "Labour and the New

¹ See James Peter Warbasse, "The Coöperative Consumers' Movement in the United States," a 12-page pamphlet published by the Coöperative League of America, 2 West 13th Street, New York City. Full information concerning the starting of a coöperative society may be secured from this League.

² *The People's Year Book* (1921), p. 399.

Social Order."¹ The four fundamental propositions of this report are:

(1) The universal enforcement of a national minimum; whereby all the requisites of a healthy life and worthy citizenship, including a prescribed minimum of health, leisure, education and subsistence are assured to every person.

(2) The democratic control of industry; demanding the progressive elimination of the private capitalist from the exclusive control of industry and the scientific reorganization of the nation's industry on the basis of the common ownership of the means of production; involving the nationalization of the railways, mines, shipping, canals, and other vital industries.

(3) The complete reform of national finance; instituting a system of taxation designed to obtain the necessary revenue from the largest incomes and biggest private fortunes, including steeply graduated income and inheritance taxes.

(4) The surplus wealth to be used for the common good; preventing the monopolistic absorption of the wealth of the community by individual proprietors; to be achieved by means of nationalization and democratic control.

In the United States labor candidates have from time to time been elected to various municipal, state and national offices. Prior to the 1920 election the Farmer-Labor Party was organized. That the vote of its candidates was not larger was due in part to the refusal of the American Federation of Labor to coöperate in promoting a new party. In large measure it was due to the general ignorance and apathy of the workers. Efforts are now being made to arouse the workers to the support of this new party, and plans are being made for the nomination of labor candidates in the coming state and national elections.²

In England, Australia, New Zealand and other countries, labor parties have exerted a wholesome influence and have supplemented and strengthened the efforts of trade unions to raise the standard of well being among the working classes.

¹ Copies may be secured from the *New Republic*, 421 West 21st St., New York, for five cents. A full discussion of this report may be found in Chapter 7 of Professor Harry F. Ward's recent book, "The New Social Order."

² Full information concerning the plans of the Farmer-Labor Party may be obtained from the columns of the weekly periodical, *The New Majority*, published in Chicago, subscription price \$2.50 per year.

SOCIALISM

Socialism is concerned with causes, ends and means.¹ The first of its fundamental doctrines—the economic interpretation of history—has to do with causes. Marx and many succeeding socialists contend, to quote Bertrand Russell, “that in the main all the phenomena of human society have their origin in material conditions.” According to this view, politics, law, philosophy and religion are determined primarily by economic factors.

Socialists analyze the present industrial order and bring a severe indictment against it, pointing out the enormous waste and inefficiency in production and distribution, and the existence of widespread poverty among the masses and excessive luxury among the privileged. They maintain that these sharp contrasts are inevitable under a system of capitalistic production. In order to alleviate human misery, and to increase human happiness, they propose, therefore, to abolish capitalism and to substitute a new industrial order to be known as the socialist commonwealth.

A second doctrine of socialism—communal ownership and democratic control of land and capital—has to do with ends. Socialists are not agreed as to the extent of communal ownership. In this connection, Dr. Harry W. Laidler, secretary of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, says: “Socialists do not believe in the elimination of private property. They do not advocate the public ownership of all industry. Voluntary coöperation and private ownership may exist to a considerable extent under Socialism, particularly in the handicraft industry, in farming and in intellectual and artistic production. Public utilities, natural resources and basic industries, however, should, socialists believe, be owned by the municipality, state and nation, in order that exploitation may cease, that waste may be eliminated and that equality of economic opportunity may be secured. . . . Contrary to a widespread belief, socialists are not opposed to inequality of compensation if such inequality is based on a difference of ability and productivity, and seems necessary from the standpoint of social efficiency.”²

A third doctrine of socialism—the class struggle—deals with means. Socialists are not agreed as to the weapons of the class struggle, some advocating violent revolution, others putting their

¹ See Bertrand Russell, “Proposed Roads to Freedom,” for a suggestive discussion of Marx and socialist doctrines. See also Dr. Harry W. Laidler, “Socialism in Thought and Action,” for a comprehensive discussion of socialism. For a vigorous criticism of socialism see O. D. Skelton, “Socialism: A Critical Analysis.”

² Harry W. Laidler, “Study Courses in Socialism,” pp. 11, 12.

dependence in the ballot and united economic action. An overwhelming majority of socialists in England and America are opposed to violence and seek to bring about gradual constitutional changes by means of the ballot, supplemented by the coöperative movement, economic action and education. This fact was brought out by Mr. Morris Hilquit in the course of the expulsion trial of the socialist assemblymen at Albany, in these words: "I think I shall not be contradicted if I say that they have not read a single official party declaration or any other authoritative socialist statement advocating violence as a means of attaining the socialist ends. . . . We socialists, as strong believers in social evolution have always been the first to decry and ridicule the romantic notions of changing the fundamental forms of society, the economic basis of society, by acts of violence or by conspiracy."¹

Socialism has many critics. Conservative thinkers criticize socialism because of its radicalism. Left wing radicals criticize socialism because of its conservatism. Among the conservative criticisms most often advanced are the following: Socialism would stifle incentive, decrease efficiency, produce mediocrity, increase bureauracy, increase political corruption, fail to provide for future improvements in industry, destroy religion and the family. Socialists maintain that these are not valid objections, that all of them have been successfully answered.

Socialism in one form or another is sweeping across Europe. For good or evil, it is a force to be reckoned with. Every student of social problems should, therefore, thoroughly familiarize himself with the arguments for and against socialism.

SYNDICALISM

Mr. Bertrand Russell tells us that "syndicalism arose in France as a revolt against political socialism." He further informs us that "syndicalism stands essentially for the point of view of the producer as opposed to that of the consumer; it is concerned with reforming actual work and the organization of industry, not merely with securing rewards for work. It aims at substituting industrial for political action."²

The essential doctrines of syndicalism are producers' control and the class-war. The chief industrial weapons used are sabotage and the general strike. Syndicalists are advocates of industrial unionism, as contrasted with craft unions; that is, they seek one

¹ Morris Hilquit, "Socialism on Trial," pp. 34, 35.

² Bertrand Russell, "Proposed Roads to Freedom," pp. 56, 62.

big union instead of many small craft unions. Syndicalists desire not only to destroy capitalism, they seek also to destroy the political state. They would have government entirely in the hands of the producers. Syndicalists believe in direct action.

In the United States, the I. W. W. is a syndicalist organization, advocating industrial unionism and control by the workers. Mr. Russell quotes the secretary of this organization as saying: "There is but one bargain the I. W. W. will make with the employing class—complete surrender of all control of industry to the organized workers."¹

THE NATIONAL GUILD MOVEMENT

Within the last decade a new solution has been proposed, chiefly by a small group of influential scholars in England. The followers of this movement call themselves National Guildsmen. They are vigorous critics both of state socialism and syndicalism. They object strenuously to the high degree of centralization and bureaucracy of state socialism. Most guildsmen differ from syndicalists in desiring to retain the political state.

National guildsmen would make use of both political and industrial methods in bringing about the new social order. The essentials of the guild system may be summarized briefly as follows: (1) Government by function; (2) self-government in each industry; (3) decentralization; (4) abolition of the wage system.

In the place of two branches of government, House of Lords and House of Commons or Senate and House of Representatives, both political and elected on a territorial basis, most National Guildsmen would have two houses; one political, with representatives elected on a territorial basis; one industrial, with representatives elected by trades or industries.

National Guildsmen advocate state ownership of natural resources and basic industries. They do not, however, believe in state operation. They would have each of the basic industries controlled and operated by a national guild, composed of all persons employed in that industry, including managers, foremen, clerks, skilled mechanics and manual workers.

National Guildsmen strongly advocate decentralized control, in

¹ Quoted in Russell, p. 77.

There are two reasons why we do not include in our list of proposed solutions a discussion of the Russian Soviet Republic: first, the extreme difficulty of arriving at the facts as to what is actually taking place in Russia; and, second, the rapid changes which are being made in the policies of the Soviet Government.

political government and in industrial government. By decentralization they hope to avoid bureaucracy.

National Guildsmen would abolish the wage-system, where human labor is regarded as a commodity and bought in the labor market on a basis of supply and demand, and would substitute therefor a system of pay as a human being, the amount of pay to be determined by the cost of maintaining a satisfactory standard of living and by the nature and degree of service rendered to the community. They do not advocate equality of pay, but they would pay in times of sickness and unavoidable unemployment.

Many careful observers are convinced that the trend of the times is in the direction pointed out by the National Guildsmen. The members of this movement are not agreed among themselves on all points. The movement is in its infancy and its permanent policies are yet to be determined. An increasing number of scholars and leaders are convinced, however, that it has within it vital elements of worth and is surely destined to make a contribution toward the solving of our social problems.¹

CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES

The need of a deeper emphasis upon the human factor in industry is increasingly recognized. Enormous strides have been made within recent years on the mechanical side of production. We are not so well off in the realm of human relationships. This is the soil in which most of our difficulties are rooted. We are coming to realize that schemes and systems are insufficient in themselves. What is needed is a new spirit, a new attitude, a new motive, a new relationship. If all parties concerned were motivated by the proper spirit, any one of several kinds of social organization would be satisfactory. Without the proper spirit, no scheme or system will produce the desired social order.

Religion is concerned with relationships. Within recent years the churches have realized the importance of applying the fundamental principles upon which they are founded to industrial problems. Most of the influential church bodies have issued official pronouncements concerning Christianity and social questions.

In England the Archbishops' committee submitted a most vigorous and challenging report.² The Committee on the War and

¹ Among the many recent books dealing with the guild movement those of G. D. H. Cole are probably the most vigorous and stimulating, especially his "Self-Government in Industry" (1919 edition with special introductory chapter giving his changed viewpoint) and his "Guild Socialism Re-Stated."

² An excellent 147-page book, entitled "Christianity and Industrial Problems," published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 6 St. Martin's Place, London, W.C. 2.

the Religious Outlook, composed of a score of Christian leaders in the United States, has recently issued a notable volume, called "The Church and Industrial Reconstruction."¹ The Report on the Steel Strike of 1919, issued by the Commission of Inquiry of the Interchurch World Movement, has been widely circulated.²

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has issued a pronouncement called "The Social Ideals of the Churches."³ The National Catholic War Council has issued a statement dealing with "Social Reconstruction."⁴ The Central Conference of American Rabbis has issued a "Social Justice Program."⁵ Numerous church conventions have adopted official declarations on the social question.

What are the principles of Jesus that have a bearing upon our present industrial problems? Mr. Sherwood Eddy has outlined these principles as follows:

(1) **PERSONALITY**, involving the infinite and equal worth of every human being; man is always an end, never a means to an end, and is of more value than all material possessions.

(2) **BROTHERHOOD**, involving the close kindred of the human race; all persons are members of one family, with God as common Father; all are bound together in social solidarity; no man can live to himself; all men are mutually dependent, and each should love his neighbor as himself.

(3) **SERVICE**, as the chief motive of all endeavor; service for the common welfare receiving supremacy over the seeking of private gain.

(4) **LIBERTY**, involving the right of each individual to self-realization, self-expression and self-determination; obligating Christians to aid in providing these things for all men.

(5) **JUSTICE**, involving the condemnation of all forms of exploitation and oppression of the weak by the powerful; condemning the neglect of the needy by the more fortunate.

¹ Published by Association Press, 347 Madison Avenue, New York City. 296 pages, cloth binding \$2, paper cover \$1. This book should be owned by every student of industrial problems.

² Published by Harcourt, Brace & Howe, 1 West 47th Street, New York City. Cloth binding \$2.50, paper cover \$1.50. For a criticism of this report see "Mistakes of the Interchurch Steel Report," by Rev. E. Victor Bigelow; copies may be obtained from the United States Steel Corporation, 71 Broadway, New York City.

³ "The Social Ideals of the Churches" may be secured from The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, 105 East 22nd Street, New York. It is also printed as an appendix in "The Social Task of the Church, as set forth by the Lambeth Conference." This latter is a valuable 28-page pamphlet and may be obtained from the Department of Christian Social Service, 281 Fourth Avenue, New York. Price 25 cents.

⁴ Copies may be obtained from the Council, at 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C.

⁵ This was published in the *Survey*, for September 1, 1920. Copies may be secured from Rabbi Horace J. Wolf, Rochester, New York.

(6) **ACCOUNTABILITY**, involving responsible stewardship of all talents, wealth and privileges; the degree of responsibility and obligation to be determined by ability and opportunity; God is the owner of all, man is a steward and is responsible to God and man, as his brother's keeper.

(7) **LOVE**, the culmination and summary of the principles of Jesus; the two great commandments being love toward God and love toward man; love expressed in the Golden Rule constituting the corner stone of the Kingdom of God, the name Jesus used for the new social order.

Few Christian men would deny that Personality, Brotherhood, Service, Liberty, Justice, Accountability and Love are the great social principles of Jesus or that he called men to live in accordance with these principles. The difficulty comes in determining how and when to apply these principles in concrete situations. Living as we do in such a complex social order, there is surely room for honest differences of opinion between Christian men concerning programs and policies. And yet, in the light of these principles, are there not certain aspects of the industrial problem upon which all of us should be agreed?

In the light of the principle of the infinite worth of Personality, should not the first charge on industry be the support and protection of all persons engaged in that industry? Does not such support and protection involve an income sufficient to maintain a standard of living in decency and comfort, provision or insurance against unemployment, regulation of hours of work, provision of safety devices and the adoption of health measures?

In view of the principle of Brotherhood, should not coöperation in industry be substituted for merciless competition? Should not friendly relations and coöperative effort be substituted for bitterness and class-strife?

Judged by the principle of Service, is a person justified in seeking first his own private gain? Should not the nature and degree of service rendered be the test of approbation and reward? Does not this principle involve individual and social efficiency and the maximum development of industry consistent with the welfare of the workers?

In the light of the principle of Liberty, is not the test of industry the degree of opportunity given to employer and workman to attain self-realization, self-expression and self-determination? Does not this involve the right of workmen to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing? Does not self-expression involve an increasing degree of

self-government and democracy in industry, as in the political realm?

In view of the principle of Justice, what shall we say concerning the excessive inequality of wealth and power? Does not this principle demand at least an approximate equality of opportunity for all men? Do children born in the homes of the poorer two-thirds of our population have approximate equality of opportunity with those born in homes of luxury and privilege?

Judged by the standard of Accountability, is there any justification for selfish expenditure and excessive luxury? Does any man possess the right to use his power and property in such a way as to do great harm to his fellows, or to withhold his power or property from service for the good of all? Is any man justified in wasting or using inefficiently his labor and energy? Is society justified in allowing a privileged few to monopolize the returns from natural resources and from the toil of the masses?

If Love is the dominating principle, what shall we say of class bitterness? Does the intensity of competition in modern industry increase or decrease good will among the various employers? Is the Golden Rule widely observed in modern industry?¹

NEXT STEPS

Let us summarize briefly the major facts outlined herein. We are living in a time of universal unrest and commotion. Our society is an acquisitive one, in which personal rights and privileges take precedence over functions and obligations. We are confronted, on the one hand, with a vast concentration of wealth and power, and, on the other, with multitudes who are living in actual poverty or on the borderland of destitution. A disconcertingly large proportion of our wage earners, through low wages and unavoidable unemployment, receive an annual income quite insufficient to maintain them and their families in decency and comfort, in spite of the fact that many of them are obliged to work inhumanly long hours. The solutions proposed are numerous and varied, ranging from paternalism and benevolent industrial autocracy to exclusive workers' control.

When confronted with such complex problems and such varied solutions, what are we to do? Three things, it seems to the present writer.

¹ Readers will find it profitable to send five cents for a copy of "The Golden Rule in Business," by Arthur Nash, published by the Murray Press, 359 Boylston Street, Boston. This is a vivid account of an employer who sought to run his business on a basis of the Golden Rule. As a result, production was increased enormously, wages were raised, prices were lowered, and harmonious relations were established.

First, we must get a clear grasp of the great ethical principles which are to be used as our scale of values. This is absolutely imperative. For the Christian, this will necessitate a fresh study of the teaching of Jesus, and an effort to catch his spirit and viewpoint. We can proceed safely only as we are sure of our ethical principles.

Second, we must ascertain the facts in the case. Decisions must be based upon fact, not upon prejudice or passion. One of our greatest dangers is intolerance, the refusal to consider both sides of a question or to grant to others an equal right to their own opinions. Suppression and denunciation simply mean further confusion. Only as we proceed with open mind and earnest purpose can we hope to discover the facts in the case. Without the facts, our principles are of little avail.

Third, we must seek to apply the principles to the facts. We must test the facts by the principles, and reach our decision and determine our program accordingly. This involves the willingness to make experiments in seeking adequate solutions. To apply high ethical principles to the facts of modern industry requires courage. Patience is another needed virtue. We shall look in vain for a speedy "cure-all." The attitudes and traditions of modern society are rooted far back in human history. Modern industry cannot be reconstructed over night. Disappointment awaits the person who is depending upon some panacea to solve our industrial problems quickly.

The very seriousness of the present situation constitutes a stirring challenge. The demand is for the same degree of loyalty to conviction, the same willingness to live or die for vital principles, the same courage and steadfastness in the presence of danger, that has motivated the highest type of soldier, statesman, martyr and missionary. The issue at stake is nothing less than the fate of civilization and the progress of the Kingdom of God.

APPENDIX I: THE COLLEGIATE INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH MOVEMENT

A notable development in relating college students to the problems of the industrial world has been the Collegiate Industrial Research Movement. Under expert leadership a score of university students from several western colleges engaged as common laborers in various industries in Denver last summer. Several evenings a week they met in seminars as a discussion group. They were all Christian men, seeking with open mind and without prejudice sympathetically to understand both the employers' and workers' point of view. Four of them were working on the street car lines at the time of the great Denver car

strike. One night they would hear the case of the company stated by its representative, the next night the case of the strikers stated by the labor leader, on another evening the legal aspects of the case would be stated by one of the counsels. The next night a social service expert would speak to the students and be questioned by them. Following this invaluable experience, which let them see something of the very heart of the labor problem, they returned to college with a small amount of money to help on expenses during the coming year. These men are now pursuing their studies in sociology and economics, or studying the industrial problem in regular meetings throughout the college year. During the coming summer similar groups of Christian students under sane and safe leadership will enter industry in a number of the great industrial cities of America. They are thus helping to bridge the gulf between the educated and the uneducated, the Church and the masses, the privileged and the unprivileged, capital and labor.

The requirements for admission to a group are (1) attendance at a Student Conference; (2) agreement to enroll for the entire course (six to eight weeks) and to abide by regulations; (3) payment of the registration fee of \$5; (4) the passing of a physical examination; (5) brief preliminary reading such as "The New Spirit in Industry," "What's on the Worker's Mind," "The Church and Industrial Reconstruction."

Those desiring further information may consult the local college Y. M. C. A. president, General Secretary, State and International Student Secretaries, or address the Student Department of the International Committee, 347 Madison Avenue, New York City.

APPENDIX II: LIST OF BOOKS ON CURRENT PROBLEMS

Savel Zimand, *MODERN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS*, 240 pages, published by the Bureau of Industrial Research, 289 Fourth Ave., New York. The latest and most comprehensive descriptive bibliography on social problems. Price, \$1.80.

Walter Rauschenbusch, *THE SOCIAL PRINCIPLES OF JESUS*, 198 pages, Association Press, 347 Madison Ave., New York, \$1.15. An excellent text-book, with divisions for daily study.

The Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, *THE CHURCH AND INDUSTRIAL RECONSTRUCTION*, Association Press, 297 pages, Cloth \$2, paper cover \$1. Perhaps the best statement with regard to the application of Christian principles in modern industry, with chapters on Unchristian Aspects of the Present Industrial Order, Present Practicable Steps Toward a More Christian Industrial Order.

R. H. Tawney, *THE ACQUISITIVE SOCIETY*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 188 pages, \$1.50. A most stimulating discussion of Rights and Functions, Property and Creative Work, Industry as a Profession, etc.

Harry F. Ward, *THE NEW SOCIAL ORDER*, Macmillan Co., New York, 384 pages, \$2.50. A vigorous discussion concerning the application of Christian principles in modern society.

WHAT IS THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF WORK AND WEALTH, published by Association Press, New York, 94 pages, \$.85. Chiefly a series of brief quotations from various authorities dealing with the social problem.

Sherwood Eddy, *EVERYBODY'S WORLD*, George H. Doran Company, New

- York, 271 pages, \$1.90. A vivid account of a working tour around the world. Contains chapters on the Near East, Russia, Japan, China, India, and Anglo-Saxon Responsibility.
- THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY OF THE INTERCHURCH WORLD MOVEMENT, REPORT ON THE STEEL STRIKE OF 1919, Harcourt, Brace & Howe, New York, 277 pages, cloth \$2.50, paper cover \$1.50: Contains the results of the investigation concerning hours, wages and control in the steel industry.
- E. Victor Bigelow, MISTAKES OF THE INTERCHURCH STEEL REPORT, a 24-page pamphlet. Copies may be secured from the United States Steel Corporation, 71 Broadway, New York.
- Harry W. Laidler, SOCIALISM IN THOUGHT AND ACTION, Macmillan Co., 546 pages, \$2.75. Perhaps the most comprehensive discussion of socialism from an American viewpoint.
- Hartley Withers, A DEFENCE OF CAPITALISM, E. P. Dutton & Co., 255 pages, \$2.50. A strong statement of the accomplishments of capitalism and a vigorous criticism of socialism and the guild movement.
- Bertrand Russell, PROPOSED ROADS TO FREEDOM, Henry Holt & Co., New York, 218 pages, \$1.50. Contains historical accounts of Socialism, Anarchism, Syndicalism, and stimulating chapters on Work and Pay, Government and Law, the World as it Could be Made.
- G. D. H. Cole, LABOUR IN THE COMMONWEALTH, B. W. Huebsch, New York, 223 pages, \$1.50. Contains chapters dealing with the Humanity of Labour, the Labour Movement, Social Reformers, the Organization of Freedom.
- Arthur Gleason, WHAT THE WORKERS WANT, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 518 pages, \$4. A study of British Labor, with chapters on a Revolution Without a Philosophy, Gentle Revolution, Shop Stewards, etc., and valuable appendices.
- Bishop of Oxford and others, PROPERTY, Macmillan Co., New York, 229 pages, \$2. Contains valuable chapters on the Historical Evolution of Property, the Principle of Private Property, the Biblical and Early Christian Ideal of Property, Property and Personality.

PERIODICALS DEALING WITH CURRENT PROBLEMS

- THE SURVEY, 112 East 19th Street, New York, \$5 per year.
- THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York, \$5 per year.
- THE NEW REPUBLIC, 421 W. 21st Street, New York, \$5 per year. Three weeklies dealing with current problems from a liberal viewpoint.
- THE WEEKLY REVIEW, 140 Nassau Street, New York, \$5 per year. A weekly dealing with current problems from a conservative viewpoint.
- THE LITERARY DIGEST, 354 Fourth Avenue, New York, \$4 per year. A digest of newspaper and periodical comment on current problems.
- THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY, 508 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, \$4 a year (\$3 to ministers); Twelve weeks acquaintance subscription \$1. A liberal journal of religion. Contains notable articles on industrial problems. An invaluable weekly.
- INFORMATION SERVICE, issued every two weeks by the Research Department of the Commission on the Church and Social Service, of the Federal Council of the Churches, 105 East 22nd Street, New York. Subscription price, including special book review service, \$5 per year; special rate of \$2 to college and seminary students. Contains valuable data upon current industrial problems.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

AN ETHICAL EVALUATION OF
SOME PHASES OF TRADE UNIONISM
AND THE OPEN SHOP MOVEMENT

BY

KIRBY PAGE

AUTHOR OF "THE SWORD OR THE CROSS," "INDUSTRIAL FACTS,"
"SOMETHING MORE," ETC.



NEW YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

Ten Cents Net.

THE
DORAN BOOK
PUBLISHED

COPYRIGHT, 1921,
BY GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY



PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I: THE PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAIN- ING	5
ATTITUDE IN ENGLAND	6
PROTECTION OF THE WORKERS	7
THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION	7
COLLECTIVE ACTION NECESSARY	9
BENEVOLENT EMPLOYERS	10
PRESENT INEFFICIENCY OF INDUSTRY	11
MORALE	12
INCREASED EFFICIENCY	14
AUTOCRACY AND EFFICIENCY	16
 II: THE UNION SHOP	 17
CONCENTRATION OF CONTROL	17
OBJECTIONS TO THE UNION SHOP	19
 III: THE OPEN SHOP MOVEMENT	 21
WORDS OF DISAPPROVAL	21
REFUSAL OF RECOGNITION	23
SPIES AND INTIMIDATION	23
THE FOLLY OF REPRESSION	24
TENDENCY IN AMERICA	26
DEALING WITH FAULTS OF UNIONS	27
 IV: THE APPLICATION OF CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES	 29

AUTHOR'S NOTE

The subject of collective bargaining is of extraordinary importance. It is the heart of the present industrial struggle in the United States. Vast issues are at stake: the stability and prosperity of industry; the wages, hours, status and morale of the workers; the living conditions of a large proportion of our population—all these will be vitally affected by the decisions reached concerning collective bargaining.

This subject deserves the special interest and understanding of all who are concerned with moral and spiritual values. The development of personality, the enjoyment of abundant life, and the maintenance of high moral standards, are profoundly affected by such material considerations as insufficient income, excessively long hours, insecurity of employment, and the class struggle.

It is, of course, impossible to give an adequate treatment of such a vital theme within 32 pages. The present writer has attempted to outline briefly the major issues and to emphasize what seem to him to be the most important points. He has endeavored to be accurate and fair in his presentation of the faults of employers and union leaders alike. If he has placed primary emphasis upon the policies of one side it is because he is convinced that the burden of responsibility for our present confusion should be attributed to that group.

It is hoped that this pamphlet may be found useful for personal study and in classes, discussion groups and open forums.

KIRBY PAGE.

*December 15, 1921.
311 Division Avenue,
Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey.*

I: THE PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The necessity and value of collective action by workers is being recognized by an increasing number of business men, statesmen, professors and church leaders. The Final Report of the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations says: "It is very significant that out of 230 representatives of the interests of employers, chosen largely on the recommendation of their own organizations, less than half a dozen have denied the propriety of collective action on the part of employees."¹ President Wilson's Second Industrial Conference went on record as "being in favor of the policy of collective bargaining."² The United States War Labor Board declared that: "The right of workers to organize in trade unions and to bargain collectively through chosen representatives is recognized and affirmed. This right shall not be denied, abridged, or interfered with by the employers in any manner whatsoever."³

The United States Senate Committee on the Steel Strike declared that: "The Committee is agreed that the principle of collective bargaining is a right of men working in industry."⁴ In an address before the American Engineering Societies, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, said: "In the question of industrial conflict resulting in lockout and strike, one mitigating measure has been agreed upon in principle by all sections of the community. That is collective bargaining, by which, wherever possible, the parties should settle their difficulties before they start a fight. It is founded not only on the sense of prevention but on the human right to consolidate the worker in a proper balanced position to uphold his rights against the consolidation of capital."⁵ Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of State, says: "I

¹ Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations, Senate Document No. 415, 64th Congress, p. 64.

² Report of the President's Industrial Conference, p. 31.

³ United States National War Labor Board, Report of the Secretary, 1919, p. 52, 53.

⁴ U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Education and Labor. Investigating strike in steel industry. 66th Congress, 1st session, Report No. 289, p. 16.

⁵ Quoted in the *American Federationist*, Jan., 1921, p. 38.

trust there will be no more struggles in futile opposition to the right of collective bargaining on the part of employees." ¹

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America declares that: "An ordered and constructive democracy in industry is as necessary as political democracy and that collective bargaining and the sharing of shop control and management are inevitable steps in its attainment." The resolution passed by the Congregational Church in national session at Grand Rapids in 1919 says: "We believe that the general interest of the wage-earners is best promoted by collective bargaining, and we acknowledge the right of wage-earners to organize without discrimination, to bargain collectively." The Methodist Episcopal Bishops of the United States declared that: "We favor collective bargaining as an instrument for the attainment of industrial justice and for training in democratic procedure." The National Catholic War Council has issued a statement in which it says it is to be hoped that the right of collective bargaining "will never again be called in question." The Social Justice Program adopted by the Central Conference of American Rabbis "recognizes the right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of its own choosing."

ATTITUDE IN ENGLAND

In England the validity of collective bargaining was recognized nearly half a century ago. Concerning the two Acts of 1875, Mr. Sidney Webb says: "Collective bargaining, in short, with all its necessary accompaniments, was, after fifty years of legislative struggle, finally recognized by the law of the land." ² In England today collective bargaining is regarded as a matter of course and its validity is not questioned. In this connection, Mr. Webb says: "This practice of collective bargaining has, in one form or another, superseded the old individual contract between master and servant over a very large proportion of the industrial field." ³

Underlying these statements concerning the value and necessity of collective bargaining is the realization of certain fundamental facts. A clear understanding of these vital issues will aid us in determining our attitude toward trade unionism and the open shop movement.

¹ Quoted in "The Trade Union as the Basis for Collective Bargaining," presented by W. Jett Lauck before the United States Anthracite Coal Commission, 1920, p. 13.

² Sidney and Beatrice Webb, "History of Trades Unions" (revised edition, 1920), p. 291.

³ Sidney and Beatrice Webb, "Industrial Democracy" (1914), p. 177.

PROTECTION OF THE WORKERS

The first of these fundamental convictions is that collective action is necessary for the protection of the workers. Chief Justice Taft recently declared: "The principle of combination among workingmen is indispensable to their welfare and their protection against the tyranny of employers."¹

There may have been a time when the individual worker could bargain on an equal basis with his employer. There are doubtless still many small shops in which the employer and his few workmen are on a relatively equal basis of bargaining power. Workers in small plants may be able to look after their own interests by individual bargaining and may feel no need of collective action.

Several million American workers, however, are confronted with an entirely different situation. They are employed by the hundred or by the thousand in a given mine or plant or shop. Their employer is not an individual only slightly better off financially than his workmen. For hundreds of thousands of American workmen their employer is a huge corporation with invested capital running into the millions of dollars and with enormous reserves and credit power. In many instances control of the welfare of tens of thousands of employees is vested in a small Board of Directors in a distant city. Such directors often judge the success of the managerial staff by the rate of the annual dividend. Under such circumstances it is sheer stupidity to say that the individual workman can bargain on an equal basis with such a huge concentration of capital. In such a case there is no bargain at all, the individual worker can accept the conditions offered by the corporation or seek other employment. He has not the slightest power individually to change the offer of the corporation. Without collective action on their part hundreds of thousands of American workmen are at the mercy of powerful combinations of capital.

THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION

The seriousness of the situation will be emphasized if we consider a concrete case, that of the employees of the United States Steel Corporation. This huge corporation has a total capitalization of approximately a billion and a half dollars.² Its total undivided surplus is \$523,454,890.89.³ The number of individual stockholders in this corporation is more than 100,000, but a majority of the

¹ Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, January 22, 1921, p. 8.

² U. S. Steel Corporation. Annual Report, 1920, p. 33.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

stock is held by less than 2 per cent of the stockholders¹ and actual control is vested in thirteen directors. The degree of control exercised by the board of directors is revealed in a recent statement by Judge Elbert H. Gary, its chairman: "Some years ago, in 1912, I believe, Mr. Charles Cabot of Boston arose in a stockholders' meeting and proposed a committee to study the hours of work. I asked him how many shares he had. He replied that he had ten or twenty, I have forgotten which. I reminded him that as *I held the proxies of a majority of the voting shares* I could very easily outvote his motion. Nevertheless I was glad to vote for it, and so the committee was put in action."² That is to say, Judge Gary alone commanded sufficient votes to determine the policies of the United States Steel Corporation. The tens of thousands of small stockholders take no active part in the control of the policies and are, in any case, helpless to change the decisions of the small group of heavy stockholders.

In normal times approximately 200,000 workers are employed by the United States Steel Corporation. The corporation has consistently refused to bargain collectively with its workers. This is the corporation concerning which the Interchurch Report on the Steel Strike of 1919 said: "Approximately half of the employees in iron and steel manufacturing plants are subject to the schedule known as the twelve-hour day (that is a working day from 11 to 14 hours long). Less than one-quarter of the industry's employees can work under 60 hours a week."³ The Steel Corporation boasts that it pays the standard rate of wages or slightly in advance of the standard rate. Its skilled workers are undoubtedly well paid, many of them earning from \$10 to \$20 per day. The Interchurch Report says: "Skilled steel labor was paid wages disproportionate to the earnings of the other two-thirds, thus binding the skilled class to the companies and creating divisions between the upper third and the rest of the force." This report also says: "The annual earnings of over one-third of all productive iron and steel workers were, and had been for years, below the level set by government experts as the minimum of subsistence standard for families of five. The annual earnings of 72 per cent of all workers were, and had been for years, below the level set by government experts as the minimum of comfort level for families of five. This second standard being the lowest which scientists are willing to term an 'American standard of living,' it follows that *nearly three-quarters of the steel workers could not earn enough for an American stand-*

¹ "Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations," p. 80.

² Quoted in *Collier's Weekly*, July 23, 1921, and in *Industry*, August 15, 1921, p. 6.

³ "Report on the Steel Strike of 1919," p. 44.

*ard of living."*¹ And this in spite of the fact that tens of thousands of these workers were compelled to work the twelve-hour day and seven-day week.

On August 20, 1921, the United States Steel Corporation reduced the rate of wages of its employees, this being the third cut during 1921. The rate for unskilled laborers is now 30 cents an hour. Working 10 hours a day, six days every week, 52 weeks in the year, with no vacation or loss of time due to sickness or otherwise, such an employee earns \$936 per year. Since the cost of living is still high, it is obviously impossible for a man to support a wife and family in decency and comfort on such an income. Even if he works 12 hours per day, with no loss of time, his annual income is only \$1,123.30. This is several hundred dollars below the minimum health and decency budget.

Surely the case of the United States Steel Corporation reveals the need for a system of collective bargaining in the great industrial plants of the country. Remember the facts: Approximately half of the employees in iron and steel plants work the twelve-hour day, nearly three-fourths cannot earn enough for an American standard of living, yet the total undivided surplus of the corporation has increased from \$135,204,471.90 in 1914 to \$523,454,890.89 at the end of 1920.² Such facts are an unanswerable argument for a policy of collective bargaining for the protection of the workers.

COLLECTIVE ACTION NECESSARY

The case of the United States Steel Corporation is not an exceptional one. There is concentration of control in many other industries, notably in mining, oil, meat packing, railways. In any of the larger plants of these industries the individual workman is helpless if he seeks to bargain single-handed. This is true also of the workman in a small shop where the owner is a member of an employers' association in which common policies are agreed upon. Collective action is essential if workmen are to receive adequate protection.

Experience has shown that it is not safe to leave the welfare of the workers exclusively in the hands of the employers. In many cases where the employer engages only a few workers, knows them intimately and deals with them personally, the workers receive adequate consideration. There are doubtless many employers with hundreds of workers where the interests of the workers are safeguarded. But after due allowance has been made for all such

¹ "Report on the Steel Strike of 1919," p. 85.

² U. S. Steel Corporation. Annual Report, 1920, p. 33.

cases, the fact still remains that the only adequate protection for hundreds of thousands of American workmen consists in their ability to bargain collectively.

After many years of intimate contact with great corporations, Mr. Samuel Untermyer, one of the leading attorneys of the United States, felt constrained to say: "Capitalism is more powerful, more rampant, more despotic, and less controlled by law or public sentiment with us than in any other country. It lacks the most elemental sense of justice and fights every inch of the way regardless of the merits of the controversy."¹ After his experiences as attorney for the Lockwood Investigating Committee of the New York State Legislature, where he rendered conspicuous service, Mr. Untermyer also said: "I am no alarmist, but my great fear is that the country either does not sufficiently realize or has become callous to the perils that lurk in the social unrest that is being accentuated by the greed and piracy of these combinations that infest the land from end to end. They are all-powerful. It is still possible to reach the little fellows, but the biggest and most dangerous of them apparently are already above and beyond the law as it now stands."²

BENEVOLENT EMPLOYERS

Even if one is inclined to disagree with the picture of some capitalists painted by Mr. Untermyer, the fact still remains that it is unsafe to leave masses of workers defenceless before entrenched capital. This is true even if the directors are benevolently inclined and are honestly seeking the welfare of the workers. History is filled with illustrations where men of undoubted good will have been unconscious of the sufferings of their employees or have taken it for granted that such suffering was inevitable and beyond hope of removal. During the early part of the 19th century, a cotton mill owner in England by the name of Mr. G. A. Lee, who was noted for his philanthropy, defended his action in compelling the children in his mills to work from six o'clock in the morning until eight o'clock in the evening by saying: "Nothing is more favorable to morals than habits of early subordination, industry and regularity."³ A group of employers opposed the reducing of the working hours of children below thirteen hours a day, because "these hours agreed with the children wonderfully. Factory children were healthier, more intelligent, more moral than

¹ Quoted in the *Arbitrator*, April-May, 1921, p. 10.

² *New York World*, May 27, 1921.

³ Quoted in J. L. and Barbara Hammond, "The Town Labourer," p. 163.

others.”¹ Men and women who reasoned like this were not particularly heartless or cruel. They simply took the world as they found it. “The doctrine that poverty was inevitable and incurable put a soft pillow under the conscience of the ruling class.”² Concerning many of the employers who compelled men, women and children to labor inhumanly long hours for less than a living wage, it has been said: “They were essentially scholars, men of taste and refinement, who enjoyed nothing more than talking about literature, the meaning of words, the ideas of writers, or history, or pictures, or travel.”³

When it comes to the needs of the workers, the judgment of the employer alone is not to be trusted, no matter how benevolent or well intentioned he may be. Henry White says: “An employer who does not contend that he is paying as much as his business will allow would be a curiosity.”

Let us go one step further. Even if an occasional benevolent employer does correctly gauge the needs of his workers and is able to protect them, such employers are hopelessly in the minority and the mass of workers are unprotected unless they band themselves together for collective action. “The problem,” says Henry White, “is not a matter of the liberality of the individual employers, but of general conditions that can be improved only by a uniform upward pressure which the wage-worker himself must apply. In doing this he must encounter the opposition of employers, who naturally object to being disturbed, and who resent interferences with their time-honored prerogatives.”⁴

The benevolent employer who is really desirous of helping his workers should remember that philanthropy is often bestowed in such a way as to weaken the capacity for self-help. Long ago we learned that certain kinds of charity do the poor much more harm than good. Charity wrongly administered may serve only to pauperize still further the recipient. In like manner, paternalistic welfare work may weaken the self-reliance of the workers. Surely the most effective way of advancing the permanent well-being of the workers is to help them to reach the place where they can provide for themselves.

PRESENT INEFFICIENCY OF INDUSTRY

As conducted at the present time industry is grossly inefficient. Consider the facts. In the United States we have at our disposal countless inventions and machines which have enormously

¹ Hammond, p. 162.

² *Ibid.*, p. 202.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 274.

⁴ American Economic Association, “Proceedings,” 4:173-182.

increased our productive capacity; we have an elaborate transportation system that enables us to convey our raw material and our finished products with great ease; we have uncounted thousands of highly skilled mechanics of all kinds; we have an abundant supply of labor power. With what result? All over the United States today there are thousands of business men who are on the verge of bankruptcy and who would go to the wall if seriously pressed by their creditors. More than four million workers are seeking in vain for employment. Thousands of families are in actual destitution through no fault of their own. Other thousands of families are only a few weeks removed from actual want. It is doubtful whether conditions at present are any better than in 1915 when the Commission on Industrial Relations found that "a large part of our industrial population are, as a result of the combination of low wages and unemployment, living in a condition of actual poverty. How large this proportion is can not be exactly determined, but it is certain that at least one-third and possibly one-half of the families of wage-earners employed in manufacturing and mining earn in the course of the year less than enough to support them in anything like a comfortable and decent condition. The terrible effects of such poverty may be outlined in a few paragraphs, but their far-reaching consequences could not be adequately shown in a volume."¹

These are the facts: On the one hand, unbounded capacities of production; and on the other, poverty for many, insufficiency for others, danger of business failure for others. It does not require an expert to discover that somewhere along the line there is gross inefficiency. Opinions differ as to the source of the difficulty. No competent observer, however, attempts to deny that at the present time industry is inefficient.

MORALE

Some people say that chief blame should be laid at the door of labor. It is said that workers are loafing on the job, indifferent as to the grade and degree of their work, and often guilty of deliberate restriction of output. One fact at least is clear: *the morale of many workers is at a low ebb*. Many workers are filled with fear and dread, feeling their helplessness to find continuous employment and to maintain a proper standard of life. Most workers fail to have a sense of responsibility for the success of the industry. They have little or no power to affect the policies and plans of the industry. They have no sufficient incentive to efficiency. The

¹ Senate Document No. 415, 64th Congress, pages 22, 23.

amount of income received by many workers for ten or twelve hours of daily toil is insufficient to maintain a decent and comfortable standard of living; they often live under circumstances wholly unfavorable to wholesome life; they often have an exaggerated idea as to the wealth of their employers and are keenly resentful and bitter against their employers and society in general. Such is the condition and attitude of hundreds of thousands of workers in the United States. Morale is badly shattered. It is useless to expect efficient production so long as such conditions and such attitudes prevail.

When it comes to suggestions as to ways and means of improving the morale of the workers, there is a great variety of opinion. Whatever else may be required, it seems certain that morale can not effectively and permanently be sustained without increasing the power and responsibility of the workers. This calls for some kind of collective action on their part. In this connection, Justice Brandeis says: "My observation leads me to believe that while there are many single things—single causes—contributing causes to unrest, that there is one cause which is fundamental, and it is the necessary conflict between—the contrast between—our political liberty and the industrial absolutism. The end to which we must move is a recognition of industrial democracy as the end to which we are to work, and that means this: it means that problems are not any longer, or to be any longer, the problems of the employer."¹

Mr. Wm. B. Dickson, Vice-President of the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co., bears similar testimony: "I believe that one of the first steps necessary to inspire the workmen with confidence in the sincerity of the employers' recognition of the proper status of labor, is the adoption of a fair system of collective bargaining."²

President Wilson, in his Message to Congress, of May 20, 1919, pleaded for "the genuine democratization of industry, based upon a full recognition of the right of those who work, in whatever rank, to participate in some organic way in every decision which directly affects their welfare or the part they are to play in industry."

Morale is the great factor in the efficiency of workers. With the spread of education and democratic ideas, workers will never render their best service so long as they are unprotected and unrepresented in the control of the conditions of their working lives. Morale is necessary to efficient production. In the case of many workers, collective bargaining is necessary to morale.

¹ "Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations," p. 63.

² "Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science," Sept., 1919, p. 24.

INCREASED EFFICIENCY

One of the chief objections raised by those employers who are opposed to collective bargaining is that it decreases efficiency in production. Hundreds of employers all over the United States, however, have demonstrated conclusively that collective bargaining makes for increased production. Impressive evidence of this character was recently presented before the United States Railroad Labor Board.¹ This evidence cites many instances of satisfactory trade agreements reached by collective bargaining in many industries.

As an illustration of the attitude of many employers, Mr. Grange Sard, a prominent stove manufacturer of Albany, is quoted: "I have been through the mill, so to speak. I have fought the union. I have thought it was to the interest of the manufacturer to destroy the union. But I have been shown the error of my way, and I am prepared to say now and have thought for many years that it is the wise employer who encourages rather than discourages unionism. The Stove Manufacturers' Defence Association was organized in 1886 for the purpose of fighting the union, of resisting what we termed unjust demands. We had our fight with the Union, and at the end we each had more respect for the power and fighting qualities of the other, so that in 1891 we had a conference committee appointed representing six employees and six employers. They drew up an agreement which should fix the rate of wages and conditions in shop for the current year. Since 1891, we have had no strikes of any consequence."² In this connection, Mr. Boris Emmet is quoted: "The Stove Founders' National Defence Association has now a membership of 73, of which 72 maintain full union conditions in their shops. The conference agreements are unique in the sense that not once in the 26 years of their existence did there arise any question which proved impossible of solution. Most delicate and vital problems, such as the regulation of apprenticeship, introduction of labor-saving machinery, limitation of output, wages, etc., have been amicably solved in a manner mutually satisfactory."³

Concerning the trade agreement in the glass bottle industry, Mr. Leo Wolman says: "The adherence of the employers to the agreement is easy to explain. In the first place, this system of collective bargaining, by maintaining uniform wage scales and

¹ "The Development of Collective Bargaining on a National Basis," prepared by Carter Goodrich and presented by W. Jett Lauck before the United States Railroad Labor Board.

² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

working rules throughout the whole industry has eliminated the objectionable inequalities as between different employers, that are an inevitable accompaniment of a decentralized system of collective bargaining. Second, the history of the agreement has been such as to modify to a considerable degree the attitude of the employers toward their workmen."¹

The testimony before the Commission on Industrial Relations brought out the fact that in the pottery industry trade agreements had been in operation for fourteen years. One of the commissioners asked Mr. John A. Campbell, president of the Trenton Potteries, this question: "Isn't it true, Mr. Campbell, that under the old conditions you, as an employer, had much wider liberty than now; you were supreme and could dictate and determine any conditions without consulting labor; but now you are, in a measure, strait-jacketed, let me call it; you cannot make a move without consulting labor, and to that degree you have given up a part of your liberty. Has the result justified you in giving up part of your liberty?" To which Mr. Campbell replied: "Well, of course, that statement of yours will have to be modified a little. While you might be entirely independent, at the same time, you were certainly in hot water a good portion of the time. You paid for your independence. It was a sort of hot-water independence."²

In this connection, Mr. Wm. M. Leiserson, Impartial Chairman of the Rochester Clothing Market, says: "Employers in Chicago and Rochester, who have within the last year or two entered into collective bargaining arrangements with the union of clothing workers, have stated that the production per man an hour in their shops has actually increased under this arrangement, although this was a time when most other industries have been suffering from curtailment of production."³

Collective bargaining may not only raise the morale of the workers, it may help to increase the efficiency of the employer. As a result of extensive investigation, a committee of the Federated American Engineering Societies,⁴ of which Mr. Herbert Hoover was president, recently declared that at present *industry is 75 per cent inefficient, of which labor is responsible for 25 per cent, and management is responsible for 50 per cent.* That is to say, the employers are twice as responsible for inefficiency as are the workers.

¹ "The Development of Collective Bargaining on a National Basis," prepared by Carter Goodrich and presented by W. Jett Lauck before the United States Railroad Labor Board, p. 17.

² *Ibid.*, p. 18.

³ "Annals of the American Academy," Sept., 1920, p. 45.

⁴ Digest in U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Monthly Labor Review*, Sept., 1921, pp. 493-503. The full report is soon to be published by McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York City.

AUTOCRACY AND EFFICIENCY

We have assumed that autocracy is efficient. "There is a common superstitious belief," says Mr. Leiserson, "that democracy is always less efficient than autocracy, and therefore industrial efficiency is bound to suffer to the extent that democracy is introduced into industry. To the boss, the foreman, the superintendent or the employer, whose word has been law to his employees, it may appear most absurdly inefficient that he should have to discuss his orders with his employees and consult them about his policies. But when we remember that it has been his rule that brought us opposition to machinery and improved methods from the workers, restriction of output, strikes and lockouts, labor turnover of 400 or 500 per cent and more, and the great decrease in production that most industries now suffer, it must be quite plain that there is nothing efficient about autocratic control of industry."¹

Mr. Felix Frankfurter, formerly Chairman of the War Labor Policies Board, has expressed the opinion that: "What American business needs is a substitution of the processes of law and order for the present oscillation between anarchy and autocracy by which it is too largely governed. Not until we constitutionalize industry shall we approach aright our industrial questions. Not until those principles which we have proved and tested and established in our political life are transferred, with the necessary adaption to our industrial life, can we really deal with any permanence with the questions which the war has left as legacies to social agencies and the country at large."²

¹ "Annals of American Academy," Sept., 1920, pp. 47, 48.

² Quoted in Lionel D. Edie, "Current Social and Industrial Forces," pp. 324, 325.

II: THE UNION SHOP

Many employers who recognize the right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively are unwilling to recognize or to deal with national unions. They have installed shop committees or company unions. In some instances employment is refused to men who are known to be members of a national union, in other cases no attention whatever is paid to membership in national unions. Some employers are convinced that the interests of workers and employers alike are better protected by collective bargaining through company unions, rather than through national unions. Unfortunately, however, some employers are installing company unions merely as the most effective way of fighting national unions. They regard collective bargaining as an infringement upon their rights, but choose company unions as the lesser of two evils.

Company unions do offer a medium for collective bargaining and seem to be a step in the right direction. It is true, however, that they are too often under the domination of the employer and lack independence and power. Ultimate power and final veto are usually reserved by the management. Company unions are often paternalistic in their origin and are dependent upon the benevolence of the employer. They often lack security and permanence, due to the fact that should this employer die or should the business change hands the whole scheme may be scrapped by the new employer. Company unions tend to make the employees of a given shop contented so long as their own interests are safeguarded, and indifferent to the welfare of workers in other shops. This tends to break the solidarity and common action of the employees in a given industry.

CONCENTRATION OF CONTROL

There is another important reason why company unions are not an adequate channel for the most effective collective bargaining. The policies of employers are not always determined separately for each shop or plant. In many cases there is concentration of control. The Commission on Industrial Relations found that: "A careful and conservative study shows that the corporations controlled by six financial groups and affiliated interests employ

2,651,684 wage earners and have a total capitalization of \$19,875,200,000. These six financial groups control 28 per cent of the total number of wage earners engaged in the industries covered by the report of our investigation. The Morgan-First National Bank group alone controls corporations employing 785,499 wage earners.”¹

In addition to this concentration of capital and the power of the bankers, the position of the employer is made stronger by the existence of employers' associations in most industries. Through these associations of employers, common policies are often determined and great pressure is brought to bear upon the individual employer to stand by the common decision. Mutual help is given in event of labor disputes. The American Employers' Association provides that “in the event of a strike or similar trouble, financial support should be given to the one afflicted, and also moral support. This is an important factor in the hour of trouble.”²

Under such circumstances it is difficult or impossible for the employees of a single shop to bargain on an equal basis with their employer. The Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations says: “To suggest that labor unions can be effective if organized on less than a national scale seems to ignore entirely the facts and trend of present-day American business. There is no line of organized industry in which individual establishments can act independently. Ignoring for the time the centralization of control and ownership, and also the almost universal existence of employers' associations, the mere fact of competition would render ineffective any organization of employees which was limited to a single establishment. Advance in labor conditions must proceed with a fair degree of uniformity throughout any line of industry.”³

Mr. V. Everit Macy, former Chairman of the Ship Building Labor Adjustment Board, says: “Nothing but discord and anarchy results from the independent action of shop committees or local unions. The national unions, like the national association of employers, can view policies from a national standpoint. They have greater responsibilities, and, therefore, give all questions more careful thought before acting. Local organizations cannot long survive if they act without the approval of the national bodies. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance to strengthen the hands of the responsible trade union officials.”⁴

Mr. Herbert Hoover recently emphasized the fact that “nation-

¹ Senate Document No. 415, 64th Congress, p. 80.

² Quoted in the *American Federationist*, Feb., 1921, p. 114.

³ Page 65.

⁴ “The Development of Collective Bargaining on a National Basis,” p. 34.

wide organization of labor is essential in order to cope with the unfair employers."¹ Chief Justice Taft has said: "Labor unions have been necessary to secure to the individual working man an opportunity to deal with his employer on an equality and free from the duress of immediate want of a daily wage."² Some years ago President Roosevelt declared: "I believe emphatically in organized labor. I believe in organization of wage workers. Organization is one of the laws of our social and economic development at this time."³ Professor Edwin R. A. Seligman says: "The individual workman is nowadays helpless against the typical employer. His only hope lies in association. Freedom of contract is illusory because of the self-evident inequality. The trades union is an attempt to restore to the individual as a member of the group the equality which has been lost through the transition from small-scale to large-scale industry. The trades union is as inevitable a product of modern economic life as the corporation."⁴

The union shop⁵ offers the most effective form of collective bargaining for the protection of the workers, for the building up of morale, and consequently, for the maximum efficiency of industry.

OBJECTIONS TO THE UNION SHOP

To catalog all of the objections to the union shop would require much more space than we have at our disposal.⁶ Perhaps the most serious of these objections may be grouped under four general headings.

First, the weaknesses and faults of the unions and of union members. A strong case may be made at this point. The unions do have many weaknesses. These weaknesses are constantly being given wide publicity by the opponents of the unions. There is no doubt that some union men have been and are guilty of many of the charges made against them, including graft, bribery, corruption, violence, intimidation, breach of contract, deliberate restriction of output, loafing on the job, and general indifference to the welfare of the industry.

¹ *Industrial Management*, April 1, 1921, p. 228.

² "The Trade Union as the Basis for Collective Bargaining," p. 13.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

⁵ A union shop is one in which wages, hours and working conditions are determined by an agreement between the employer and representatives of the union. Some union shops employ only union members. Other union shops employ non-union men as well. Some union men are employed in non-union shops. The test as to whether a shop is union or non-union is whether or not the employer recognizes and deals with the union.

⁶ For a lengthy discussion of the objections to unions, see the "Open Shop Encyclopedia for Debaters," published by the National Association of Manufacturers, 30 Church Street, New York, 247 pages.

A second objection to the union shop is that unions tend to deprive the individual worker of his personal freedom, and to dictate as to where he may work and as to his wages, hours and working conditions. Some employers who are opposed to the union are much concerned about the freedom of the individual worker and seek to save him from the dictation of the union. They maintain that where agreements are made between the managers and representatives of the union the freedom of the non-union worker is interfered with.

A third objection is that the union shop tends to deprive the employer of his liberty of action. In the union shop the management is compelled to consult representatives of the union on various matters. To the employer who has been accustomed to "run his own business" such interference by representatives of the union is irritating.

A fourth objection is that the unions represent an undue concentration of labor power and are therefore a menace to public welfare. Many unions possess enormous power and sometimes do not hesitate to use this power for selfish ends, at the expense of the general public. It is also maintained that unions tend to emphasize class differences and to accentuate the class struggle.

III: THE OPEN SHOP MOVEMENT

Based upon one or more of these objections to the union shop, an open shop movement is sweeping across the country. Since there is much confusion concerning the use of the terms "open shop" and "closed shop," let us analyze these terms. The New Jersey Chamber of Commerce has listed nine varieties of open and closed shops, as follows: (1) closed anti-union shop, (2) preferential anti-union shop, (3) open non-union shop without shop committee, (4) open non-union shop with shop committee, (5) open indirect union shop, (6) open union shop, (7) preferential union shop, (8) closed union shop of an open union, (9) closed union shop of a closed union.

It will thus be seen that the present open shop movement for a shop in which men are employed without reference to membership or non-membership in the union *ignores the vital issue*. In such an open shop the employer may or may not deal with the union. The terms "open shop" and "closed shop" are indefinite and misleading and *should not be used without designating the kind of shop really meant*. This point was strongly emphasized by the Commission on Industrial Relations, as follows: "Whereas the commission finds that the terms 'open shop' and 'closed shop' have each a double meaning, and should never be used without telling which meaning is intended, the double meaning consisting in that they may mean either union or non-union: Therefore, for the purposes of this report, be it resolved that the Commission on Industrial Relations will not use the terms 'open shop' and 'closed shop' but in lieu thereof will use 'union shop' and 'non-union shop.'" ¹

WORDS OF DISAPPROVAL

At the present time those employers who are seeking to cripple or to destroy effective unions are making their attack under the guise of a movement for the open shop. Their method is to advocate a shop in which men are employed without regard to membership or non-membership in the union, their real purpose often is to make ineffective all union activity. This fact was brought out

¹ Page 265.

by a manufacturer, Mr. Oliver T. Remmer, in speaking before the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, concerning an open shop resolution: "Why doesn't the resolution plainly say what it means, instead of by deceptive language claim to stand for the utopian, when its real purpose is to suppress organized labor? Why does it not get on all fours and say so, calling a spade a spade?"¹

Another employer, Mr. Ernest G. Draper, President of the American Creosoting Co., in a letter to the *Weekly Review*, said concerning the open shop drive: "If we are unprejudiced, then, we can conclude with perfect truth that the fight against the closed shop as such is no fight at all. Can we predict that the activity of the open-shop campaigners will cease when the absurdity of their purpose is disclosed? Of some of the fairer employers, yes. But of the others, no. They are out to crack organized labor and to crack it wide open. They will do it carefully, secretly perhaps, with the aid of any convenient slogan. But they will do it, if they can."²

Ex-President Taft recently pointed out that: "It is the custom of Bourbon employers engaged in fighting labor unionism to the death to call a closed non-union shop an open shop and to call the movement to kill unionism an open-shop movement. This is a deceitful misuse of the term."³

The National Catholic Welfare Council says in this connection: "The 'open shop' drive masks under such names as 'the American Plan' and hides behind the pretense of American freedom. Yet its real purpose is to destroy all effective labor unions, and thus subject the working people to the complete domination of the employers."⁴ A further statement issued by the National Catholic Welfare Council says: "In general, few if any of the organizations that have declared in favor of the 'open shop' avow their attitude toward collective bargaining. This is the vital issue. Not only has no 'open shop' organization declared that the 'open shop' employer would deal with the union, but every such organization that has confessed its attitude on this subject, has admitted that this practice would not be tolerated. Up to the present, no authorized representative of an 'open shop' organization has denied that collective bargaining with the union is inconsistent with the 'open shop.'"⁵

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has issued a statement in which it is declared that: "The relations between employers and workers throughout the United States are

¹ Quoted in Savel Zimand, "The Open Shop Drive," p. 11.

² The *Weekly Review*, January 12, 1921, p. 34.

³ The *Baltimore News*, Feb. 5, 1921.

⁴ Quoted in "The Open Shop Drive," p. 45.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

seriously affected at this moment by a campaign which is being conducted for the open shop policy—the so-called American Plan of Employment. These terms are now being frequently used to designate establishments that are definitely anti-union. Obviously, a shop of this kind is not an open shop but a closed shop—closed against members of labor unions.”

REFUSAL OF RECOGNITION

Even where the open shop movement is not a conscious attempt to destroy the unions, wherever it is opposed to recognition of unions, its actual effects, when successful, are to cripple or to destroy the unions. “I am not antagonizing unions,” said Judge E. H. Gary, of the United States Steel Corporation. “I am not saying that they have not a perfect right to form unions, of course they have.” The United States Steel Corporation maintains that it does not antagonize unions. It simply refuses to confer with representatives of unions or in any way to recognize the existence of unions.

Concerning the testimony of Mr. Eugene G. Grace, President of the Bethlehem Steel Co., before the Lockwood Investigating Committee of the New York State Legislature, the *New York World* made the comment that the admission had been forced “that he, personally, the Bethlehem Steel Co., the Bethlehem subsidiaries, and practically all the steel interests of the country are endeavoring to kill off union labor and to create non-union shops if human ingenuity can do it.”¹

SPIES AND INTIMIDATION

In their fight against unions many of the employers who are backing the open shop movement are resorting to under-cover methods—spies, blacklists and discharging employees for union membership. Extensive investigations made by the Cabot Fund, by the Committee of Enquiry of the Interchurch World Movement, and by other agencies, have proved conclusively the widespread use of industrial spies.

The Interchurch Report on the Steel Strike says: “The steel industry was under the domination of a policy whose aim was to keep out labor unions. In pursuit of this policy, blacklists were used, workmen were discharged for union affiliation, ‘under-cover men’ and ‘labor detectives’ were employed and efforts were made to influence the local press, pulpit and police authorities.”²

¹ Quoted in the *Literary Digest*, Jan. 1, 1921.

² “Report on the Steel Strike of 1919,” pp. 14, 15.

Eighty-six pages of the second volume of the *Interchurch Report* are devoted to a citation of the evidence of labor espionage in various steel plants.¹

Investigators for the Cabot Fund for Industrial Research of Boston found that industrial espionage "operates through the secret service departments of great corporations, the railroads, the United States Steel Corporation, the Western Union Telegraph Company and like corporations. It operates through the spy services of employers' associations; The National Erectors' Association, the National Manufacturers' Association, The National Founders' Association." "

The evidence is beyond dispute that certain groups are attempting to deal with the faults of trade unions by a policy of suppression under the guise of a movement for the open shop and with the aid of labor spies, blacklists and intimidation.

THE FOLLY OF REPRESSION

Attempts on the part of employers to destroy the unions by fair means or foul are foolish and are sure to have vicious results. It is utterly impossible to crush organized labor. Such a movement may seem to succeed for a time. But with the spread of education and the growth of democracy, workers cannot long be kept from combining for mutual defence. It is only a question of time until they gain sufficient collective strength to resist the tyranny of employers.

If employers who are seeking to destroy unions were wise, they would recognize that a policy of repression is futile and can only lead to violence and destruction. History has many lessons to teach at this point.

About a hundred years ago the employers of England tried to destroy trade unions. In 1799 and 1800 they succeeded in passing the Combination Acts, which expressly penalized all combinations whatsoever. "Under this Act any workman who combined with any other workman in order to get an increase of wages or a decrease of hours was liable to be brought up before any single magistrate—it might be one of the employers for whom he was working—and on conviction be sent forthwith to jail for three months, or to hard labour in the House of Corrections for two." "

As early as 1786 five London bookbinders were sentenced to two years' imprisonment for leading a strike to reduce hours from

¹ "Public Opinion and the Steel Strike," pp. 1-86.

² "The Labor Spy," a 72-page pamphlet published by the *New Republic*, 421 West 21st St., New York, price 15 cents.

³ Hammond, "The Town Labourer," p. 120.

twelve to eleven.¹ Seventeen tanners at Bermondsey in 1834 were sentenced to imprisonment for the offence of leaving their work unfinished.² In 1834 seven Dorchester laborers, including two itinerant preachers, were given the monstrous sentence of seven years' transportation to Botany Bay for the sole crime of administering oaths as a part of the ritual of "the Friendly Society of Agricultural Labourers." "No accusation was made, and no evidence preferred against them, of anything worse than the playing with oaths. Not only were they guiltless of any intimidation or outrage, but they had not even struck or presented any application for higher wages."³

During the great strike of the miners in 1844 Lord Londonderry in his dual capacity as mine-owner and Lord-Lieutenant of Durham County, not only superintended the wholesale eviction of strikers from their homes, but also ordered the resident merchants in "his town of Seaham" to refuse to supply provisions to the strikers, on pain of forfeiting his protection.⁴

For many decades in England public opinion was strongly in favor of suppressing the unions. Lord Shaftesbury, champion of factory legislation, expressed the hope that "the working people may be emancipated from the tightest thralldom they have yet endured. All the single despots, and all the aristocracies that ever were or ever will be, are as puffs of wind compared with these tornadoes, the Trade Unions."⁵ John Bright thought that "combinations, in the long run, must be as injurious to the workman as to the employer against whom he is contending."⁶ Wilberforce was strongly in favor of the Combination Acts forbidding trade unions. Dr. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester, publicly suggested the village horsepond as a fit destination for union organizers.⁷

In England for many decades every possible means was used to destroy trade unions. Employers, government officials, journalists and clergymen, agreed that organizations of workers were dangerous and every possible legal and economic weapon was used against such combinations. All of this effort at suppression was unsuccessful. The tide has ebbed and flowed but on the whole there has been a steady growth in the strength of trade unions in England. Happily a change of sentiment has now taken place. The right of workers to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing is rarely challenged. Collec-

¹ Webb, "History of Trades Unions," rev. ed. 1920, p. 79.

² *Ibid.*, p. 143.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 166.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 293.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 293.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 332.

tive bargaining has largely replaced individual bargaining in all of the great industries and a majority of employers greatly prefer to deal with the unions rather than to make individual bargains with each of their workers.

In Russia we find an excellent illustration of the consequences of repression. The attitude of the former imperial government toward all movements of workers is well known. Suppression was the recognized policy. Imprisonment, banishment and execution were the weapons used. With what results? An explosion that blew away the old régime and has all but ruined the industry of Russia. Recent happenings in Russia cannot be understood apart from a remembrance of the decades and centuries of repression and persecution of the masses.

TENDENCY IN AMERICA

Since the war there has been an increasing tendency in the United States to depend upon repression as the weapon against unrest. Mr. Sidney A. Reeve has expressed the opinion that: "The whole policy of the day is to rely upon repressing by force a discontent which, driven by expanding world commercialism, is rising, the world over, as naturally, relentlessly and uncontrollably as the tide under the pull of the moon."¹

Much of the violence displayed in labor disputes in this country has been the result of attempted suppression of trade unions. A notable recent illustration is to be found in the coal mines of West Virginia. Throughout several counties the miners are absolutely forbidden to join the union. Anti-union contracts are required by many owners. These contracts, referred to by the union as "Yellow Dog" contracts, bind the miners not to join any labor organization or in any way "to aid, encourage or approve" the formation of such an organization.²

Under these contracts it is unlawful for the union members or organizers to ask a miner who has signed such a contract to join the union. The courts have held that under such circumstances to ask a man to join the union is to seek to persuade him to break his contract, and hence is unlawful. The courts are therefore granting injunctions against the United Mine Workers of America, forbidding them to solicit members among those miners who have signed these contracts. The Supreme Court of the United States has upheld the validity of such injunctions. This

¹ "Modern Economic Tendencies," p. 721.

² See Winthrop D. Lane, "Civil War in West Virginia," p. 64, for a full account of the facts in the case—published by B. W. Huebsch, New York, price 50 cents.

has created a situation where, in the words of Professor John R. Commons, "persuasion to join a union is as unlawful as violence."¹

What are social consequences of this suppression of the unions? The answer is: bitterness, violence, murder, civil war, a "three-day battle," when it is estimated that 100,000 shots were exchanged, martial law!

Repression may seem to succeed for a time. It did in Russia. But sooner or later it will fail. And then the flood. In so far as the present open shop movement is directed toward the suppression or destruction of the unions, it is short-sighted and its consequences will be vicious. Suppression is not the way out of our present difficulties. Such a procedure can only lead us deeper and deeper into the morass of bitterness and inefficiency.

DEALING WITH FAULTS OF UNIONS

The present writer wishes to emphasize the fact that he has not the slightest desire to overlook or excuse the faults and excesses of the unions. He does believe, however, that attempted suppression is not the way to deal with the faults of the unions, some of which are undoubtedly serious. The proper procedure to follow, in his opinion, is the correction of the faults of the unions, full recognition of the unions and friendly coöperation with them. Patience, sympathy and persistence of effort are required.

In this connection the Bureau of State Research of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce says: "The unions, indeed, are not ideal, but neither are the individual employers nor the employers' associations. The defects of the unions need not be countenanced, but with proper effort could surely be eliminated. By getting together in a round-table conference the employers and the union leaders could well point out to each other the shortcomings of their practices and argue the matter out until mutually satisfactory improvements were agreed upon. Surely, no improvement in union practices could be secured by ignoring them or still more by throwing bricks at them whenever a favorable occasion presents itself."²

In dealing with this point, Henry White says: "The labor movement possesses such elements of strength that its deficiencies can be candidly admitted in order that they may be more readily corrected. To seek to destroy unions because of their defects would be like attempting to abolish government because of its

¹ Quoted, *Ibid.*, p. 10.

² Quoted in "The Trade Union as the Basis for Collective Bargaining," pp. 70, 71.

abuses. The unions with all their faults represent a forward stride to the human race. They cultivate a spirit of self-reliance and mutual assistance which ought to more than compensate for their faults." ¹

From the many testimonies in similar vein, we choose two others. In an address before the Boston Chamber of Commerce last year, Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, said: "The trade unions of the United States have conferred such essential services upon their membership and upon the community that their real values are not to be overlooked or destroyed. They can fairly claim great credit for the abolition of sweat-shops, for recognition of fairer hours in industry, reduction of overstrain, employment under more healthful conditions, and many other reforms. These gains have been made through collective bargains and part of the difficulties of the labor situation today is the bitterness with which these gains were accomplished. In my own experience in industry I have always found that a frank and friendly acceptance of the unions' agreements, while still maintaining the open shop, has led to constructive relationship and mutual interest." ²

Justice Brandeis of the United States Supreme Court has said: "Most people admit the immense service which the labor unions have rendered to the community during the last twenty years in raising of wages, shortening of the hours of labor, bettering of conditions under which labor is performed, and protecting women and children from excessive or ill-timed work; but the services which the labor unions can render in the future are even greater than they have rendered in the past. The employer needs the unions 'to stay him from the fall of vanity'; the employees need them for their protection; the community needs them to raise the level of the citizen. Strong, stable trades unions can best serve these ends. Peace and prosperity, therefore, are not to be attained by any attempt to weaken trades unions. Our hope lies rather in their growing strength." ³

¹ Quoted in "The Trade Union as the Basis for Collective Bargaining," p. 93.

² *Ibid.*, p. 13.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

IV: THE APPLICATION OF CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES

There are certain Christian principles that need to be brought to bear upon this issue. According to the teaching of Jesus, the ultimate goal of endeavor is the creation of a society in which is afforded the maximum opportunity for the development and enrichment of every human personality; the supreme motive is that of love and good-will and the desire to aid in the creation of a society in which all may share in the good life; the dominant method is that of overcoming evil with good and of friendly coöperation for the common good.

If these Christian principles are applied in the present industrial struggle, what decisions will be reached? Can we not agree upon the following?

(1) *Exploitation Must Cease.* There can be no doubt that at the present time large numbers of the poorer and weaker workers are being exploited by the strong. They are laboring unduly hard without receiving a just share of the products of their toil. In this day of huge corporations and concentration of control in industry, is it not necessary for the workers to unite in collective action in order to avoid exploitation? If it is a Christian duty for the strong to bear the burdens of the weak, should not our sympathies and efforts be on the side of the exploited and disinherited of the earth?

(2) *Every person should be afforded an adequate opportunity for self-development and self-expression.* Such an opportunity is not afforded to thousands of workers at the present time, due to insufficient income, unduly long hours of labor for many and forced unemployment for others, unwholesome living conditions and other unfavorable factors. Lack of material advantages is not the only barrier to self-development. Thousands of workers have little or no voice in deciding the conditions of their working lives. Is it not true that autocratic control in industry is a denial of the right of the workers to an adequate degree of self-determination and self-expression? Is not collective bargaining a medium through which the workers may express themselves? Does it not make possible a larger degree of freedom for the workers?

(3) *Production for social use rather than for individual profit and power.* The desire to serve should be the dominant motive of all who engage in industry. In the light of this principle, shall we not condemn the subordination of the well-being of the workers to dividends and profits? Shall we not condemn dishonesty and graft, whether on the part of employer or union leader? Shall we not condemn deliberate restriction of output for selfish purposes, whether by the employer or worker? Shall we not condemn the closed union, wherein, by one means or another, membership is restricted to a chosen few? Shall we not condemn the shop, where, in order that the employer may retain autocratic control, employment is denied to active members of unions?

(4) *Friendly coöperation should replace unrestricted competition.* Bitterness, intimidation, violence, and breach of contract, violate fundamental Christian principles and should not be tolerated. The present policy of unrestricted competition and commercial anarchy should be replaced by a policy of friendly coöperation, built around accepted rules of law and order. Industry, as well as government, should be based upon a constitution. "We, the people" should determine what this constitution is to be.

In conclusion, can we not agree that while collective bargaining is not a universal panacea for all of our industrial ills, since we have giant corporations and highly centralized control of industry, collective bargaining through national unions is needed for the adequate protection and development of the workers, for efficiency in production for social use rather than for individual profit and power, for the extension of democracy in industry and the building up of an industrial constitution as the basis for coöperative effort in the service of all?

Each, 32 pages. Ten cents net.

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY, PUBLISHERS
244 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK

No. 1—INDUSTRIAL FACTS, BY KIRBY PAGE.

Concrete data concerning such industrial problems as concentration of wealth and control, poverty, low wages, unemployment, long hours.

Brief descriptions of such proposed solutions as welfare work, employees' representation, open shop campaign, trade unions, the coöperative movement, labor party, socialism, syndicalism, national guild movement.

Statement of Christian principles that have a bearing upon these problems.

10,000 copies sold within three months.

No. 2—COLLECTIVE BARGAINING, BY KIRBY PAGE.

An ethical evaluation of some phases of trade unionism and the open shop movement.

No. 3—FELLOWSHIP, BY BASIL MATHEWS AND HARRY BISSEKER.

Preface by Sherwood Eddy.

A consideration of fellowship as a means of building the Christian social order. This pamphlet emphasizes the importance of group discussion in seeking light upon industrial problems and the need for closer coöperation between those of like purpose.

Persons desiring quantities of these pamphlets for use in classes, discussion groups or open forums, or for distribution among their friends, may secure them at the rate of 70 cents for ten copies, or \$6.00 per hundred, postpaid, from Kirby Page, 311 Division Avenue, Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey.

46

FELLOWSHIP

A MEANS OF BUILDING
THE CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ORDER

BY
BASIL MATHEWS
AND
HARRY BISSEKER

WITH A PREFACE BY
SHERWOOD EDDY

NEW  YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

Ten Cents Net.

COPYRIGHT, 1921,
BY GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

COPYRIGHT, 1920, BY EDWIN S. GORHAM



PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PREFACE

The peoples of the earth are in confusion. In the presence of complex and dangerous problems, they stand perplexed and hesitating. They need light. The disastrous consequences of a war waged in the spirit of high idealism have left many with a cynical attitude toward all ideals. They need vision. In the present hour men and women of high ideals are tempted to be unduly timid and cautious about proclaiming their message. The forces of reaction are in the ascendancy. Slander and persecution await those who run counter to accepted traditions. Courage is needed.

Confronted with complex problems, cynical indifference and the attacks of reactionaries, many men and women of high purpose are lonely and discouraged. Some feel that they alone of all the multitude have not bowed the knee to Baal. They need inspiration and companionship. In this hour many are filled with a sense of impotence. They need coöperation from those of like mind and purpose.

Light! Vision! Courage! Companionship! Coöperation! These are sorely needed.

The book from which the following extracts are taken represents the beginning of a literature in Great Britain born of a new experience. A number of "Fellowships" have been formed in England which have rediscovered some of the hidden springs of life and power of early Christianity. Mr. C. A. A. Scott in his chapter on "What Happened at Pentecost," in that most helpful volume on "The Spirit" edited by Canon Streeter, maintains that the new thing which took place on the day of Pentecost was the emergence of fellowship. A new type of life had appeared in the world. It was the life of God in the hearts of a community of men in fellowship with the Living Christ. This fellowship on the divine side was the organ of the Spirit, an extension of the Incarnation, the "body of Christ" on earth, the social organism for the expression of the very life and being of God in human personalities. On the human side the fellowship was the organ of spiritual insight. Together, of one heart and soul, under a common leadership, they realized a common mind, and growingly

apprehended the will of God. Together in a deepening fellowship with God and man they shared a common life and went out to conquer a world with an enlarging experience of love that multiplied as it was shared.

It is this experience of a spiritual fellowship, the very life of God shared with a group of men and women in harmony with His purpose, that is a supreme need of our time, and especially in our own country. The American is so motor-minded, rushes so instantly into action and organization that he does not take sufficient time for deliberation. It is to such an enlarging experience of fellowship in thought and prayer that this book calls us.

Recently a group of persons from ten states gathered together in New York City. After two days of prayer and discussion, there was general agreement that a Fellowship for a Christian Social Order had spontaneously come into being. These persons are now endeavoring to gather together informal Fellowship groups in various centers throughout the United States. Persons who are interested may secure further information concerning this movement by communicating with its secretary, Mr. Kirby Page, 311 Division Avenue, Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey.

Information concerning The Fellowship of Reconciliation, composed of men and women who seek to apply the principles and spirit of Jesus in all relationships of life, and who hold an uncompromising attitude toward sanctioning or participating in war, may be secured from Bishop Paul Jones, 108 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

We are deeply indebted to the authors and publisher of the book *Fellowship in Thought and Prayer* for permission to print these extracts for wider circulation.

SHERWOOD EDDY.

December 15, 1921.
347 Madison Avenue,
New York City.

NOTE

This pamphlet is a series of excerpts from the book *Fellowship in Thought and Prayer* by Basil Mathews and Harry Bisseker (copyright, 1920, by Edwin S. Gorham)—111 pages. Copies may be secured at the rate of \$1 each from the publishers, Edwin S. Gorham, 11 West 45th Street, New York City.

We are deeply indebted to the authors and to the publisher for permission to print these excerpts for wider circulation.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I: THE MEANING OF FELLOWSHIP	9
II: FELLOWSHIP IN THOUGHT AND PRAYER	17
III: FELLOWSHIP IN ACTION	28

I: THE MEANING OF FELLOWSHIP

“The lack of Fellowship is hell.”

—WILLIAM MORRIS.

I

Fellowship, like all elemental things, defies definition. Its subtle and powerful essence escapes through the closest mesh of words. Those who have in any full sense shared intimate fellowship will feel a disappointing inadequacy at any attempt to express its reality. The power of fellowship in life, its transforming influence in personality, and its revolutionary moral power can never be conveyed by any form of words to those who have not shared it.

At root, fellowship is a living intercourse between personalities. It is such an intercourse charged through and through with both freedom and love, and kept active by a common aim. Love is at once the tether of the comradeship and the stimulus of its corporate life in pursuit of the quest. Freedom is the “wind on the heath” of fellowship, keeping the affection of the Round Table from becoming stale or stagnant or oppressive.

Fellowship, then, is an active comradeship between personalities, men or women or both, who unite with one another in a common worship, or battle for a common quest, or play their game for the honour of a team, or pool their separate thoughts in constructing and carrying into effect a single plan, or who simply share the needs and desires of a common humanity. “These are the ties which, though light as air, are as strong as links of iron.”

Fellowship, in short, is all that divine and human commerce between souls which makes a number of separate men into a living group. In fellowship they pull together like a team tugging the wagon of life forward. They move together like a boat's crew swinging as one man in a disciplined unity of will to win their race. A group in real fellowship has, in fact, many of the qualities of a personality. Through the power of fellowship

separate personalities blend in a society of friends that has an identity, a characteristic quality, and a power of concerted action that increase the potentialities of each individual.

The story of man is full of the revolutions in human conditions made by the power of such fellowship exercised in groups of men. Such groups have often centred in the attractive and compelling power of some personality dedicated to an idea. Yet that personality itself is the creation as often as it is the creator of fellowship. In fact, fellowship rarely takes permanent form unless the compelling force that draws the men together is greater than any human personality. The cohesive power is normally exercised by loyalty to an idea or co-operation in a steadily pursued plan or a common worship.

Great movements in the world's history, associated as they are in the popular conception with the leadership of some powerful personality, can generally be traced in origin to the seed plot of some group of men whose fellowship in thought and often in prayer has itself been the nursery of that man's power of great leadership. John Woolman moving in his circle in America, and Wilberforce with his friends in England, debated and developed those germinal ideas which destroyed on the battlefields of America and in the Parliament of Britain the slavery that was arraigned first at the judgment bar of the Christian conscience. John Henry Newman, in concert with the flaming souls of Hurrell Froude and the others of their group, nursed and fanned the sparks that blazed out in the Oxford Movement. Mazzini and his comrades proclaimed and fought for the twin doctrines of nationality and liberty that now begin to govern the world. The Gottesfreunde similarly prepared the mind of Teutonic Europe for the stormy message of Luther. The Holy Club meeting in Wesley's room in Lincoln College toughened the fibre and speeded and strengthened the indomitable wills that transformed England. Francis of Assisi with his group of Poor Brothers gave Europe such a vision of the divine light on earth as she had not seen before nor has witnessed since. And above all stands that first fellowship which moved through the villages of Judæa and by the cornfields and lake side of Galilee and then went out to "turn the world upside down."

These examples that leap to the memory illustrate the irresistible power of fellowship working in men who are so welded to one another by a common loyalty to a great idea that they have one will, one faith, and one divine ambition. In them we discover that the leader is essentially the voice of the fellowship; we realise the truth of Bishop Brent's declaration that "the leader is simply the foremost companion."

In the quickening atmosphere of such confident and intimate fellowship, where

Thought leaps out to wed with thought
Ere thought can wed itself with speech;

and where men's separatist rivalries and competing ambitions are annealed and welded into a loyal common pursuit of a single quest, we discover the principle of moral co-operation in redeeming the world.

II

Nothing, however, is more fatal to fellowship than uniformity among those who compose it, or complete agreement in their views.

The fallacy that a group is best when it consists of men or women of one type of mind or similarity in outlook is perilous. Uniformity of temperament or agreement in all opinion makes fellowship anæmic and flaccid. Fellowship is at once tested and strengthened by the pooling of divergent views and coalescing of varied personalities. The brilliant and glorious strength, the rich, full-blooded vitality of the first Christian fellowship lay in the fact that the team of the twelve included such personalities as Andrew the gentle but persistent, Peter the impetuous but uncertain, the mystical yet aggressive Sons of Thunder, Thomas the sceptical logician and Matthew the dedicated business man. Indeed one cause of the anæmia and dulness that paralyse much of our modern fellowship lies on one side in the fact that we draw in the cautious Thomases and shrewd Matthews, but tend to freeze out the other types by questioning the good taste of the volcanic and explosive Peter (coming in too with the smell of fish on his linen!) and by agreeing that after all John, amiable dreamer as he is, is "not what we should call practical."

But in reality, that "infinite variety" is the very fountain of power in fellowship when it is caught up into the vital unity of a common leader and a single quest. And that diversity in unity finds superb power and immortal validity when the loyalty is given to the Son of God and the single quest is the campaign for His world kingdom. It is then—and only then—that the horizon of the fellowship is ultimate and the resources of its power are infinite. The supreme fellowship is the Christian Fellowship.

If fellowship, then, is rooted in intercourse but does not involve either uniformity of type or identity of opinion, what normally is the basis on which the intercourse proceeds? As a rule it is

rooted and grows from a common spiritual experience which issues in a common spiritual experience to achieve a certain aim. To examine the fellowships that we have given as examples, the groups which created and carried through the Franciscan Movement, the Methodist Revival, the Oxford Movement, the Anti-Slavery Campaign, and the Young Italy Campaigns, is to discover in them all those qualities of a common spiritual experience and quest. In every case differences are many and divergence of view is pronounced; but unity regulates and controls the differences.

The glory of the gift of fellowship lies in the fact that, while action is based on the discovered and experienced unity, thought becomes fullest and most fruitful when it audaciously explores the territories of difference. To penetrate without flinching through these dreaded places of divergence has proved again and again, as Livingstone discovered when he crossed the Great Desert, that the land which men had always declared to be a desert turned out to be a whole continent "full of great rivers and many trees." In particular, it has been proved most richly that to Christian folk who keep their hearts quick to the ultimate fact of their unity in Christ it is possible to explore to their farthest depths those forests of difference which have kept men apart, and to discover that, after all, the solution of our divergences will be reached, not by surrendering our sacred convictions, but by discovering a higher, richer, more glorious and hitherto unsuspected synthesis. And the unifying power by which that synthesis is reached is always personal fellowship in a real experience of Christ.

III

The strength of fellowship reposes, then, on the fact that to men of limited view and partial capacity immense enrichment at once of personal power and of corporate action comes from sharing their thought and their prayer in dedication to a common aim. But, although the feebleness and relative futility of individual men are thus swallowed up in the larger powers of corporate thought and action, the actual desire for fellowship is not a product of the weakness of men; it is rooted in the very being and nature of God. "God," as Madame Guyon has said, "has an infinite desire to communicate Himself." Indeed the very heart of the supreme Act of God in giving Himself in Christ was His desire to reconcile to Himself the estranged faces of men—in a word, His aim was fellowship. God lives in fellowship, for God is Love.

That picture gallery of the nature of God—the parables—is just a series of windows into the heart of fellowship. The central idea of the shepherd in leaving the ninety and nine for the one is to complete the fellowship. The distinction between the hireling and the Good Shepherd is that the former cares nothing and the latter will give everything for the fellowship. The climax of the story of the prodigal son is the restoration of fellowship; and the damning sin of the otherwise blameless elder brother is that he refuses to join in it. The growth of the Kingdom is like leaven. The final seal on discipleship is that the men have climbed from the status of a bonds slave to the standard of the friend: they have entered into fellowship. The whole story of the Gospels, indeed, is the record of the training of a fellowship that found in the Fatherhood of God the supreme authority for the source of the fellowship of His sons.

Our definition of fellowship as living intercourse, however, involves that it can only exist where there is reciprocity. To give to men is not to have fellowship with them. Fellowship of the order that bridges all divisions of race and social status and sex is not made even by giving the most heroic, persistent and philanthropic service. We may die for men or give royally, yet may fail to create the one thing that they are starving for, if we do not give ourselves in fellowship; if we do not share as well as give. The paradoxes of St. Paul's song of love are all based on this fact that to preach or give money or even go to the stake are not in themselves fellowship. "You have given your goods to feed the poor," said Bishop Azariah, speaking for the people of India and addressing men and women of other races who cared supremely for India. "You have given your bodies to be burned. We would ask for love. *Give us friends.*"

This fact that human life is not fed save on such fellowship, and that fellowship comes through sharing and not merely giving, is restated vividly in Lowell's "The Vision of Sir Launfal"; where Christ, discovered by Sir Launfal in the leper with whom the knight has shared bread and water by a stream, says:

The Holy Supper is kept indeed
 In what so we share with another's need.
 Not what we give but what we share
 For the gift without the giver is bare.
 Who gives himself with his gift feeds three,
 Himself, his hungering neighbour and Me.

IV

Fellowship, then, is impossible apart from personal intercourse on a common footing. We believe that there is, when we get down to the bed-rock realities of life, no common footing to be discovered in the fact of being human. The brotherhood of man (biologically, anthropologically, ethnologically man) simply does not exist either in his history or his make-up or his prospects. Inter-class prejudices and diversities, international differences and distastes, inter-racial antipathies and even loathings make it impossible to secure a common footing there. "Experience leads me to the conviction," said Sir Sidney Olivier on the basis of experience as Governor of Jamaica, where the problem of the relationship of white and black is a permanent pre-occupation of statesmanship, "that there is no basis for inter-racial relationship save on a spiritual plane." That is to say, there is no real basis for real fellowship on a world scale save on a spiritual plane. Men, in a word, are not brothers by birth in the human sense; they are brothers by new birth in the superhuman sense. Their brotherhood finds absolute and enduring reality only in a spiritual parentage—in a word, in the Fatherhood of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. That common sonship found in sharing the sonship of Jesus Christ does in fact—and not in rhetoric—form the one permanent foundation of world-fellowship.

On the increasing practice of fellowship, in the sense of the triumph of unity over discord between nations and races, in sober fact the future of that world depends. For such fellowship beginning as it does between individual men finds a fuller operation between groups and organisations, between clans and nations and races. The whole story of human progress is, in this aspect, the dramatic record of the gradual substitution of higher forms of unity for division. So inter-tribal fighting and clan war die as the unity develops the clans into the nation or the tribes in the race. And the crucial issue of our own century is simply and centrally whether the principle of fellowship embodied in a world-league of nations and of races is or is not to supersede that lack of fellowship which (as William Morris has said) means hell, and has meant between nations in our own day a hell of inextinguishable anguish.

We have been forced by the frightful logic of war to recognise that the erection of the solitary ambition of one empire above the general right of all nations is on the international scale the precise equivalent of lack of fellowship between individual men; and that

just that failure in fellowship between nations involved humanity in the maiming and destruction of the flower of its young life and in the intolerable agony of war. But that international complex of antagonisms, that uneasy balance of armed power defending competing interests, is simply the expression in the field of international affairs of the inter-class antagonisms, the commercial rivalries, the civic jealousies, the interdenominational distrusting, and the personal bickerings that hold considerable sway in the national, ecclesiastical, local and individual life.

V

The central aim of the new world, then, is the increase of fellowship. The supreme need of men of all races is that they should share, not formal agreements that may be torn up, not superficial delimitations of influence that simply secure a temporary and uneasy peace through separation by railings and fences; but a growing fellowship of rich intercourse. The ultimate salvation of the world lies in the practice of that Christian fellowship which will alone bridge inter-racial gulfs and inter-class chasms.

To that end we need, first, fellowship within the Church and between the Churches, for, literally, fellowship is the life-blood of the Christian Church. It is the pulsating arterial flow which sets all the limbs of her immortal body tingling with divine vitality and vigor, and fits her for the service of man and the glory of God. We need fellowship between capital and labour, for there alone lies the hope—and it is a rich hope—of building up a national life in which each class shall give its service for the strength and joy of the whole. Superlatively the call comes for fellowship between races of all colours. For in a world literally made one by the miracles of physical science applied to communication and transport, and made helpless against those miracles of science applied to the slaughter of men, there is no alternative to a growing fellowship of mutual understanding save a swift and ghastly increase of inter-racial rivalry in trade ambitions and labour jealousies. Such rivalry will precipitate humanity over the precipice of universal war into the abyss of barbarism, where men will cringe in helpless terror and in unavailing remorse amid the ruins of a world whose rich heritage might have been saved by the practice of fellowship.

The supreme need of the world, then, is to replace the competing rivalries of hate by the generous rivalries of Christian fellowship on every plane of human life—individual, commercial, religious,

between the classes, international, and lastly, but supremely, interracial. Only so can the world escape, not only further degradation and the agony of greater wars, but the ultimate ruin of ordered and humane life. Beginning in the individual and working upward and outward it is essential that comity should replace conflict, that fellowship should rule in every sphere of life, and that the irresistible authority of an alliance of nations working in moral co-operation should plan and erect, assailable yet impregnable, the walls of the City of God.

II: FELLOWSHIP IN THOUGHT AND PRAYER

I

The starting-point is found in a fresh recognition—so vivid and powerful as to constitute almost a re-discovery—of three of the Church's age-long convictions.

The first of these is the belief in the Divine sufficiency. Admittedly, the Church is far too weak of herself to satisfy the manifold and bitter need of the world. For this, God, and God only, is sufficient. But that He *is* sufficient is not merely a beautiful theory; it is a most real and practical fact on which we must learn to count with a more simple directness. Though we ourselves neither are nor ever can be equal to the situation that confronts us, God is equal to it. His matchless wisdom is never baffled. The situation may well be one which He Himself did not design—the creation, not of His purpose, but of man's wilful misuse of his freedom. None the less on that account, the action for which it calls is plainly manifest to Him. So long as God lives no position will be hopeless. There can be no problem of human life, however complicated by human wrongdoing, of which He does not see the right solution.

Not only does God perceive this solution, but—and here is the second conviction—it is also His Will to reveal it. The God Whom Jesus made known, Who numbers the very hairs of our head and without Whose notice not a sparrow falls to the ground, does not dwell apart from the world that He has made. As the Incarnation has taught us once for all, He is to be found in the midst of the world's travail and agony, seeking to bring order out of chaos and moral life out of moral death. Such a God will not leave us to ourselves as we strive to act as His allies: He will be ceaselessly waiting to guide us.

At no time, therefore, need we be dependent solely upon our own wisdom: there is a higher Wisdom to which we have free and constant access. In whatever capacity we may be called upon to

act (whether as citizens or as members of a church or as private individuals), and by whatever circumstances our conduct may be conditioned (whether by those ordained of God Himself or by others originated through human folly), we can find ourselves in no position in which He is not willing to reveal the path He requires us to follow. The New Testament promise of guidance, far too prominent in its pages ever to be eradicated, implies that through our fellowship with God in Christ our own thought may be corrected and informed by the Divine thought.¹ In so far as this ideal is realised, in all the problems of the Kingdom we may count with simple confidence upon God's detailed and particular direction.

This daring assertion leads us naturally to the third of the convictions on which the deeper emphasis is being laid. Like all the spiritual gifts of God, the guidance thus claimed is spiritually conditioned. We must be ready to receive as well as He to bestow. Indeed, the Divine gift will be proportionate to the human receptivity. It is only as our will is progressively surrendered to His perfect Will that the Divine direction can be made progressively clear to us.

II

On this third conviction it will be necessary for us to dwell a little more fully. In the quest for guidance the submission of our will to God must manifest itself at two important points.

In the first place, we need to be set free from all self-assertion in our thinking. Human self-assertion forms the chief hindrance to the revelation of God's Will. It is but too easy unwittingly and unintentionally to deaden our sensitiveness to His voice through prejudice and personal predilections. Not unnaturally almost every problem is approached with an individual bias of some kind. We are apt to hold tenaciously to particular views already formed, or to particular methods rendered familiar by custom, and in consequence the peril of a bondage to our preconceived ideas is never, perhaps, entirely absent. There is the risk, again, so long as we are human, that our thinking may be influenced by our individual wishes. The knowledge that through our decision we ourselves or others may be affected in position or authority, or that some favourite plan may be promoted or frus-

¹ "In this connection I may refer to 1 Corinthians ii. 16, 'We have the mind of Christ,' which does not merely mean, we 'think' as Christ thinks, but 'Christ thinks in us'; the mental processes of the Christian are under the immediate inspiration of the spirit of Christ."—Johannes Weiss, "Paul and Jesus," p. 115. (E. T.)

trated, may readily impel our judgment in this direction or in that. All thinking into which such considerations are allowed to enter implies a merely partial consecration of the will. The love of our own preferences and desires—even in relation to the Kingdom of God—may prove an effective barrier between our souls and Him. Unless we are prepared, when we profess to seek God's guidance, to give up, should He ask it, our own strongest wishes and most deeply-rooted prejudices, we are imposing conditions upon God: we are setting Him limits within which to work; we are saying, in effect, that we pray Him to lead us *provided that the leading shall be kept within the bounds of our own fixed opinions*. It is not in such an attitude of mind that men can receive the clear revelation of the Divine purpose. For the existence of personal bias, it is true, we may not be always or wholly responsible, but for readiness to lay it aside at the call of God, we most certainly are. The underlying assumption of all true prayer for God's direction is that it is God's thought of the position, *and His only*, that we seek. In every problem that arises, we can gain the knowledge of God's will only in so far as our own minds are laid freely at His disposal. In other words, the first condition of guidance is *that we are willing to be guided*.

In the second place, when God's will has once been made plain, we must be ready, with a strong and simple faith, to accept courageously whatever situation it involves. Our preconceived ideas and hopes are not the only means of setting limits to God's guidance; we may restrict Him just as surely by a nervous fear of consequences. The acts of God are often so drastic in their character that, from our cautious human standpoint, we find it hard to understand them. Sometimes before He builds up He breaks down. Sometimes He severs ere He unifies. He rejects a chosen nation. He divides a Church. He forsakes a long-established method. He abandons some time-honoured instrument of service. Even to His own people, at the hour of crisis, such far-reaching changes are apt to bring a blind and impotent perplexity. We confuse the "accidents" with the "essence" of His working. Through long experience we have learnt so closely to associate the Divine activity with certain forms through which it has expressed itself and certain conditions by which it has usually been accompanied, that when these forms and these conditions are endangered, we begin to fear for the Divine activity itself. The result may be, and often is, that an unworthy and mistaken dread of what may happen prejudices our mind against particular suggestions, thus gravely circumscribing our susceptibility to the Divine guidance. The moral is not, of course, that we must be reckless of possible

consequences, for there is a wise and altogether necessary attention that is due to them. It is the more sane and moderate lesson that we should not, through fear of them, make ourselves their slaves, since there is no less truly a respect for them that is both cowardly and altogether dangerous. Christian men and women can never safely neglect the faith that "ventures." The great type of faith is one who went forth "not knowing whither he went." Such a faith is the second essential condition of God's guidance. Just as we must strive to free our minds from every preconceived impression so we must abandon all unworthy fear. An undue bias may be given to our thought by the one no less than by the other. There is a price to be paid for clear knowledge of God's will, and not seldom that price may be the readiness to sacrifice our trusted methods, our reliance on particular persons or the security promised by some familiar "safeguard." We must be willing, with simple faith, to take the one step that is plainly right, and go forth with God, even though it be into the darkness of the unknown.

We now see a part, at least, of what is meant by the statement that the Divine guidance is spiritually conditioned. All thinking which, by prejudice, self-interest, or fear, asserts the "self" over against the interests of the Kingdom, thereby and to that extent impairs God's power of leading us. For those men and women, therefore, who wish to receive the clearest revelation of God's mind, the removal of every such restriction becomes a simple necessity. This is the third fundamental conviction in the standpoint we are seeking to elucidate.

III

The human fellowship with God on which reliance chiefly rests is *corporate* in character. This is no disparagement of the intercourse enjoyed by each separate soul with God, the necessity for which can never be transcended. But it is believed that that solitary contact with God does not exhaust the possibilities of our communion. No one of us lives unto himself. We are members one of another, and there is none who can say to his neighbour, "I have no need of thee." Hence in our common fellowship we may experience a mutual enrichment by means of which our whole capacity of vision and of receptivity will be enlarged. "Where two or three are gathered" in the Name a special promise of the Presence is assured; and therefore a group of men and women praying or thinking together with unity of spirit and purpose may expect to receive a blessing which is more than the sum

total of, and different in quality from, the blessing each would have received through the same amount of individual prayer or thought. This revived emphasis upon the reality of the Church's corporate life and upon its necessity to the complete experience of each member is full of significance, and no one should need to be reminded that it is simply a return to the New Testament point of view. Its practical outcome in the solving of the Kingdom's problems is that it yields us a clear and definite method in our search for God's guidance. We learn to look for His direction in a spiritual communion—a communion which is fellowship with one another as well as fellowship with Him; or, rather, since there are not two experiences but one, a communion which is fellowship with one another in Him.

We have called this a "clear and definite method." Since the impression derived from a merely general statement may rather be that it is somewhat vague and impractical, it may be well to furnish a more detailed description of the manner in which it is employed. A company of men and women meet together that they may seek that richer consciousness of God, and, with it, that clearer light upon truth or conduct, their need of which has been impressed upon them. The first requirement is that their power of receptivity shall be intensified. Of God's willingness to lead them there is no question. The only point of uncertainty is in their ability to discern and to respond to His direction. Therefore they will begin with earnest and united prayer. This prayer will not be hurried; it will be a sustained act of communion. And therein they will desire four things. First, they will together wait in silence for a more vivid sense of God's Presence and Reality. In the strain and bustle of ordinary life the vision of the unseen may easily grow dim; they will tarry in stillness before God, craving the penitence and cleansing through which it may once more be made clear to them. Next, they will together pray for the coming of the Kingdom. This will be no light and easy intercession; they will reverently strive to view men from God's own standpoint, and, so far as may be, to enter into His sorrow for the world's sin and His sympathy with the world's need. And when they have thus learnt a little less imperfectly to see mankind as God sees it, alike in its transgressions and in its ultimate possibilities, they will at last be ready, in the third place, to ask for light on the particular matter in which they need the Divine illumination. They will therefore pray together that in this special situation God's own design may be made plain to them. Lastly, that all hindrance in themselves may be removed, they will seek, before they turn to examine the problem, to be freed from every form of self-

assertion. In the consciously-realised presence of God, and relying on His aid, they will try to expel from their minds all previous bias, all personal preferences and all self-seeking motives, and at whatever cost, to will God's will both for themselves and for the world.

This prayer, it is important to observe, is offered in an atmosphere of fellowship. The group of men engaged is more than a mere collection of individuals; it is a body of believers—a small but essential section of that living organism which is the Church of Christ, Himself its living Head. On this account the entire spiritual efficiency alike of every part and of the whole is immeasurably increased. Because of its mystical union with its fellows and with the Head, each separate member acquires a power never possessed and never attainable in isolation. The prayer of each, his penitence, his consecration, his very experience of God's Presence, is deepened and enriched by those of all; and, in its turn, "through that which every joint supplieth" the entire body is itself built up in love. This is no idle dream of what might be; it is a statement of what actually takes place. And it is in this atmosphere of a fellowship both real and realised that those who employ the method we interpret are first made ready for the revelation of God's will.

From this act of united communion they will pass, in the same spirit of dependence, to their task of serious deliberation. The problem before them demands and must receive the most strenuous and enlightened thought that they are capable of affording. There could be no greater error than to infer from the stress laid on communion that the method is crudely quietistic, depreciating intelligence and trusting to vague and irrational impulses. On the contrary, we have met with no assemblies of men by whom the duty of sincere and resolute thinking is more clearly apprehended. True, their ultimate reliance is upon a wisdom higher than their own. Christ's promise that His Spirit shall guide them into all the truth they believe to be, not merely a beautiful ideal, but also a practical fact on which they may safely count. None the less, beneath this confidence in a heavenly guidance there dwells no lurking hostility to human reason. The inference drawn is rather that, since God has made us rational beings, it is through our minds that He will most naturally lead us. Therefore, prepared by united communion, they turn in their search for God's will to a frank and determined discussion.

IV

This brings us to another point at which for the proper understanding of the method, the utmost clearness becomes necessary. From first to last in all their discussions these men and women endeavour to think and talk *only in the spirit of their prayer*. They will use their brains, and use them, as we have said, at least as acutely as those who lay less practical stress upon prayer. But in all their thought their minds are made subject to a higher Control. That is to say, while they will bring their keenest intelligence to bear upon the problem under consideration, they will do so not as men of self-assertion who cling tenaciously to views already formed, but as men who are honestly seeking God's *guidance* and therefore are prepared, even at the cost of strongly-rooted prejudices, to revise all earlier conclusions by any new light that He may reveal to them.

This light they are ready to receive from any quarter. Indeed, they are more than ready, they are anxious, to do so. For they realise that in thought, as in all else, we are members one of another. Here once again the fundamental fact of corporate life emerges into prominence. No one man's mind, however cultivated and sincere, can perceive the whole truth, whether in relation to conduct or in relation to thought. As the physical light, falling on various objects, is reflected in various shades of colour, each but a partial presentation of its great original, so the light of truth, reflected from men's different minds, is found to exhibit many different aspects, in no single one of which can truth's perfect image be discerned. In the second case, as in the first, the pure white light is gained *only when all these partial reflections are combined*. Each individual's view needs to be checked and supplemented by the view of his fellows. It is not merely that no separate human being ever has attained a perfect wisdom; as a separate human being he never *can* attain it. He has been so made that he will find his fullest life only in fellowship with others—a fact which applies to his intellectual life as well as to life in all its other phases. As, then, he seeks to form right judgments, he has no power, even if he had the will, to be strictly independent. He was born a member of a body, and not even in his thinking has he the right to say to another, "I have no need of thee."

That being the case, men who are seeking God's guidance in any given situation, and believe that their minds are the instruments through which He is wont to direct them, will be eager to welcome light from every possible angle. It will be assumed that no single

point of view contains the whole truth which God is waiting to reveal; and this will be acknowledged even by those among whom that point of view may be most strongly maintained. But it will also be assumed that every point of view adopted by an honest thinker will probably embody some aspect of the truth—an aspect which, however partial or exaggerated, yet cannot safely be neglected in the final synthesis; and this fact will be freely recognised even by those who regard that standpoint with the utmost initial prejudice. In other words, the path to truth, whether in thought or in action, lies along the line of accepting light from every quarter—even from that with which at first we have the least degree of sympathy—and in focussing these scattered rays into as real a unity as we are then able to attain.

V

Two features of this method call, even at the risk of repetition, for a slightly extended emphasis. (a) Since an open mind, which is only another name for willingness to be taught, is one of its essential conditions, to ignore the view of those whose ideas are opposed to one's own; to regard it with suspicion; to treat it with sarcasm or ridicule; to overcome it merely by some clever ruse; most of all, to deny, in the Name of Christ, the fundamental Christian spirit by making the difference a ground for angry and unmannerly quarrels—to do any or all of these things is as unsafe as it is pagan. However little we realise the fact, it may in reality be to close our eyes to one of the sources from which some ray of God's own light was meant to come to us, and so to limit His power of leading us into the full knowledge of His will. Therefore, every man is not only allowed but expected to say exactly what he thinks, without the slightest fear of misunderstanding or offence. It is a basal assumption that truth is stronger than error and even than partial truth, and that undue sensitiveness at hearing one's own views criticised or contradicted is a latent form of self-assertion, unworthy of a Christian. (b) Though every man's conviction is thus entitled to respect, it is accepted only in so far as, after due consideration, it appears to be the medium of Divine direction. To assign an added weight to a man's opinion in virtue of his wealth, on the ground of his status, social or official, or because, forgetful of the Christian mind, he manifests a dogmatic and imperious temper, is nothing less than a betrayal of truth. Any who expected to command so adventitious an importance would be placing human considerations before

the interests of the Kingdom: any who yielded to it would be guilty of collusion in the sin. This error, like the wish to silence judgments contrary to our own, proves a most serious obstacle in the way of God's guidance. It involves, in fact, a denial of the very spirit and temper by which that guidance is conditioned.

In conversation conducted on such principles as these the clear and definite guidance of God may be confidently expected. Badly stated in black and white, this truth may seem somewhat vague and unconvincing: experienced in actual practice, its impressiveness is at times almost startling, and some of its definite results have been remarkable. For when self-assertion has once been forsaken, and through its removal men's minds are at last made truly receptive, a very real and precious fellowship in thought is rendered possible. Mind acts freely on mind, each in its turn exploring, checking, challenging the other. The thought of each is quickened and stimulated. It rises to possibilities as yet unrealised in its moments of solitary activity. Exaggerations are corrected, deficiencies supplied, the sense of proportion duly adjusted. And in the process many earlier differences of view are found to disappear. A perceptible *rapprochement* is effected, and in the end a measure of agreement reached which at the outset would have appeared in the highest degree improbable. It is in this way that, as each individual thinker approaches nearer to a common centre, the wonderful phenomenon of *corporate thought* is experienced.

It must not be supposed, of course, that this result is always, or even generally, achieved with ease. The process is one which calls for determined thinking and untiring patience. To seem to suggest that, even in such an atmosphere, difficulties conveniently vanish of themselves would be entirely misleading and untrue. Initial differences of judgments are not to be reconciled by hastily-considered suggestions or within a previously determined time-limit: they yield only to the disinterested search which is prepared to spare neither time nor effort in seeking for the truth. In such a search, indeed, the first stage will often seem to accentuate rather than to reduce the difficulties. For since, in the final synthesis, due weight is to be assigned to the truth underlying every standpoint that can fairly be defended, the earliest step of all must be to bring each difficulty out into the open light, to consider it frankly without bias, and to endeavour to appreciate its degree of strength no less than the points at which it is capable of adjustment. Discussion of the differences of judgment thus thrown into clear relief will naturally issue in more than one kind of result. Sometimes the differences will be resolved more quickly; at other times with greater effort. Sometimes the

agreement reached will be complete; at other times it will be only partial. In each alternative, however, the progress from diversity towards unity will normally be found to be so marked and so impressive that no mere power of human persuasion will any longer appear sufficient to account for it. In the view of those by whom it has actually been experienced, there is only one explanation which will satisfy the facts. In response to their united prayer and faith they have received a very real and definite guidance of God.

VI

Here, then, is a definite and practical method of seeking to learn the will of God. Its basal assumption is that of Scripture—the abiding reality of the Divine guidance. It does not, however, in any final sense, oppose the Divine guidance to human reason. It teaches, rather, that, instead of being alternative means of direction between which we have to choose, these two are complementary the one to the other. We have not to trust *either* Divine guidance *or* human reason: our reliance should be upon Divine guidance revealed *through* human reason; but through human reason disciplined for this very purpose in two ways—firstly, by communion with God, and secondly, by fellowship in thought and prayer with other men.

It is this emphasis upon fellowship—with our fellow-men as well as with God—that forms the distinctive mark of the method we have been studying. This emphasis does not ignore the place of the individual in the world's moral and religious development. Most of our progress in the past has been inspired by great leaders of thought and action, and the need for them will probably never be outgrown. But—apart from the fact that even they are largely the product and mouthpiece of the common tendencies of their age—the personalities of great leaders are not the only medium through which Divine illumination may come to us. In the fellowship of ordinary men and women, consecrated by their devotion to Christ and to one another, there lies a power which neither the world nor the Church of the present day has learnt adequately to appreciate.

To the value and reality of this power it has been our aim to invite attention, and with this end in view we have expounded one method by which it may be applied. Needless to say, this method is not the only one available: in the great search for truth and duty the principles of fellowship may be explored along many other detailed lines than those traced out in the present

chapter. Nor, again, is the method possessed of any quasi-magical virtue, as though it could yield men direction in return for its merely mechanical application: its efficacy resides exclusively in the spiritual aim and attitude by which it is conditioned. The claim we have sought to make for it is, neither that it stands alone as a medium for guidance nor that it has acquired any arbitrary or artificial value, but that, applied with strict fidelity to its underlying principles, it has been proved by experience to be a real and powerful instrument of progress. Its employment even on a limited scale has already produced definite and remarkable results: its latent possibilities we believe to be incalculable. The Church in this generation has yet to learn the secret of fellowship. The consequences of such an enlightenment no prophet could foretell. It may be that for the Church to master that secret would be to solve her most inveterate problems and to find the key to the triumph of the Kingdom.

III: FELLOWSHIP IN ACTION

I

If our argument is valid, on the one hand, that a relatively untapped source of immense power lies in fellowship in thought and in prayer; and, on the other hand, that the world is in peril of chaos for lack of this very gift, it must follow that the immediate and sustained practice of fellowship is vital at once to the life of the Church and to the saving of the world. It is not that the Church has the choice whether she will go on living without fellowship or with it. There is no such alternative. If she has fellowship she will have life—abundantly. But if she fails in fellowship she will die. And with her would surely die the world's last great hope of a life of enduring and ordered freedom for all races of men.

We hold the lively hope of the Kingdom of God. We believe in the Church as His organ for bringing into being that new humanity which is the Kingdom on earth. Yet, we see the Church divided and faltering at its task, failing at once in vision and in action, largely through the defects of its experience and practice of fellowship in Christ; and the world in peril through lack of her leadership. The challenge is absolute and ultimate.

What, then, are we—here and now—to do?

We are called, first to build up a new life of fellowship in the Church for the world. The Christian Society, as we have seen, is ideally a spiritual fellowship denominated by the idea of the Kingdom of God. It is a brotherhood so intimately united with Christ that it is His body; its members are His members. It is so filled and fused with the Holy Spirit that its separate elements are fitly framed together in His living temple. It has the mind of Christ so fully and in such unity that His will is its will and it thinks His thought. And as His thought and will are for the redemption of men everywhere, that aim—the coming of His Kingdom—dominates its life.

Holding this ideal of the life of the Church before us steadily, with its outline clearly focussed, we discover at least four lines along which the practice of fellowship in the Church can be ad-

ventured; each avenue of exploration being vitally linked with all the others. There is, first, the life of that congregation of Christian folk with whom we worship under one roof; there is, secondly, fellowship in co-operation with the other local groups or congregations—the Christians of other denominations in the place where we live; there is, thirdly, the whole life of the denomination to which our own little local congregation belongs; and there is, fourthly, the fellowship on the larger scale of “the Holy Church throughout all the world.”

II

Christendom is sharply divided upon many issues. But in every town and city in the world concrete wrongs flourish which all Christian folk immediately recognise as evil. And there are definite, explicit principles accepted by all informed Christian consciences as foundations for reform.

There is, therefore, among Christian folk in a town, beneath the doctrinal and ecclesiastical chasms that separate them, a real basis of thorough unity both in the condemnation of wrongs and in support of needed reform. Yet those local civic evils of slum or vice or corruption persist, and in only a few places is any effective challenge being made to them, or any constructive remedy being vigorously and persistently presented. It is at once tragic and grossly sinful that a nest of courts and alleys unfit for the nurture of beasts, let alone of human beings; a plethora of public-houses in a given area; bad conditions of labour in factories or in workshops, and many other anti-social and anti-Christian evils should persist unchallenged in any city from which they could be swept away by corporate action of Christian folk.

The major cause for this general paralysis of the Church does not lie so much in the absence of a Christian conscience as in the fact that that conscience is not stimulated and mobilized. The root reason for this lack of stimulus and direction lies essentially in the lack of local fellowship. Continuous Christian fellowship in a city or village, on a corporate interdenominational basis, will bring together the separate flickering lights of the divided Christian people into one powerful and effective flame.

That flame once kindled can burn, not only to destroy old evils, but to light up new paths. The very fact of the destruction of the evil comes from propulsive and expulsive force of a new ideal. But the process once initiated not only destroys evil but builds good. It is constructive; it is architectural. A new civic con-

science is created which itself sets a new standard for the plans of the local authorities in housing, in educating, in social purity, in economic relations, and indeed in the whole complex of human relationships. If the Christian conscience in an increasing number of cities and towns of the world were fired and focussed for reshaping the life of those places on Christian principles, the social structure would rapidly be transformed into some likeness to that Divine City of which the ultimate plan is hidden in the heart of God.

What stands between us and that desired result? It is, we suggest, almost entirely the lack of conscious, continuous fellowship in thought and prayer between the Christian men and women on whose hearts the social civic wrongs around them are a haunting "concern." The men and women who are alive to the evils go about their life weighed down with a sickening sense of impotence in the fact of the crying need. They feel that alone and separate they are impotent. Yet if they were yoked together in the irresistible vigour of a living and even exuberant Christian fellowship of spiritual communion and "mental sweat"; if they continually gathered together at once to think through the problems both of principle and action and to seek unitedly for the living power to carry the results into effect, a permanent contribution to the foundation of the City of God would be made.

III

The fellowship of Christendom is broken. There is no Table Round. The seamless garment is rent. The voice of the Church is silent when it should proclaim one clear, authoritative call, and divided and feeble when it should declare one strong, authentic word to direct humanity up the steep paths that climb from the morasses that threaten to engulf man up to the shining security of the plateaux of Peace.

The challenge is absolute; the call is ultimate and inescapable. If the world is to be saved, if Christ's glory is to fill the earth, the broken fellowship must be united, the seamless mystic garment must be woven afresh. That sacred mystery which is the Church must, fitly framed together, grow unto a holy temple in the Lord; "an habitation of God through the Spirit."

"I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

"There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

"Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

Each, 32 pages. Ten cents net.

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY, PUBLISHERS
244 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK

No. 1—INDUSTRIAL FACTS, BY KIRBY PAGE.

Concrete data concerning such industrial problems as concentration of wealth and control, poverty, low wages, unemployment, long hours.

Brief descriptions of such proposed solutions as welfare work, employees' representation, open shop campaign, trade unions, the coöperative movement, labor party, socialism, syndicalism, national guild movement.

Statement of Christian principles that have a bearing upon these problems.

10,000 copies sold within three months.

No. 2—COLLECTIVE BARGAINING, BY KIRBY PAGE.

An ethical evaluation of some phases of trade unionism and the open shop movement.

No. 3—FELLOWSHIP, BY BASIL MATHEWS AND HARRY BISSEKER.

Preface by Sherwood Eddy.

A consideration of fellowship as a means of building the Christian social order. This pamphlet emphasizes the importance of group discussion in seeking light upon industrial problems and the need for closer coöperation between those of like purpose.

Persons desiring quantities of these pamphlets for use in classes, discussion groups or open forums, or for distribution among their friends, may secure them at the rate of 70 cents for ten copies, or \$6.00 per hundred, postpaid, from Kirby Page, 311 Division Avenue, Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey.

THE SWORD OR THE CROSS

AN EXAMINATION OF WAR IN THE
LIGHT OF JESUS' WAY OF LIFE

BY

KIRBY PAGE

AUTHOR OF "COLLECTIVE BARGAINING,"
"INDUSTRIAL FACTS," "SOMETHING MORE," ETC.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY
PROFESSOR HARRY F. WARD

NEW  YORK

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

Fifteen Cents Net.

(Regular Edition, \$1.20 Net.)

THE
HARVARD
UNIVERSITY

COPYRIGHT, 1921,
BY GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY



PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

INTRODUCTION

The war which was to end war has left the world with more fighting and more expenditures for armaments than before it started. The Assembly of the League of Nations is unable to adopt even the slightest practical step in disarmament. Naval authorities now tell us that the submarine is essential and military authorities proclaim that poison gas is humane. New and more deadly conflicts have swung within our horizon. That this nation may become involved in war in any one of three different directions is more of a possibility than it was in 1914. Yet the one American social worker who has assessed the human costs of the recent struggle soberly declares, after he has footed the totals, that war is the negation of civilization.

What then is to be the Christian teaching concerning war? Is it going to declare judgment on the basis of the principles set forth in the gospels or will it be only the expedient servant of nationalism and continue to exhort its followers to internecine slaughter? Is the American pulpit going to continue denouncing war in general and supporting wars in particular? This question must be fairly faced and answered, one way or the other. And time presses. Mr. Page has faced the issue and has found an answer that satisfies his soul. What he has written therefore deserves the thoughtful consideration of all those whose duty it is to teach the people concerning the moral and spiritual validity of modern war.

HARRY F. WARD,
*Professor of Christian Ethics,
Union Theological Seminary
New York City.*

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

The Washington Conference is just drawing to a close as this preface is being written. It has been a great success or a tragic failure, depending upon the angle from which it is viewed. All Christian people should be profoundly grateful for its achievements. Just at the moment, however, it seems more important to think clearly as to the causes of its failures. Newspaper correspondents are generally agreed that France and Japan are chiefly at fault. Some are inclined to blame Great Britain. It is rarely intimated that the delegates and people of the United States are responsible for the tragic ineffectiveness of the Conference, and still less is there a tendency to attribute responsibility for its failures to the churches.

The real cause of the failures at Washington is to be found not so much in the nationalistic and imperialistic policies of the French, Japanese or British governments as in the attitudes of the peoples of the earth, and especially in the attitudes of members of the different churches. The delegates at Washington have not dared to mention one of the most fundamental issues of all, namely, *the immediate outlawing of war itself*. They have been limited by public sentiment in the various countries. Public opinion is not yet ready to place the ban on war. This is not surprising when it is remembered that only recently the churches in all of the nations were used as recruiting stations and conscientious objectors were imprisoned for remaining loyal to their conviction that participation in war involves a fundamental violation of the principles and spirit of Jesus. For a thousand years the churches have given their blessing and coöperation to the wars of the respective countries.

Just as the time came in the course of human history when the churches withdrew their sanction from the torture of heretics, the fighting of duels and the holding of slaves, the time will surely come when Christian people will withdraw their sanction from war. *How much longer must we wait?* How many more millions of our young men must be slaughtered before we reach the conviction that, as a weapon of justice and democracy, war is a ghastly

failure and an absolute denial of the spirit and teaching of Jesus? If the churches are not willing to outlaw war, how can we expect statesmen to do so? Well did General Bliss say: "If another war like the last one should come, the professing Christians will be responsible for every drop of blood that will be shed."

Is not this the time for individuals and churches to act? If we wait until another war is imminent, will not prejudice and passion be so fanned by propaganda that we will be unable to think clearly or act wisely? Should not every follower of Jesus go on record now as refusing absolutely to sanction or participate in any war between nations?

To the end that the utmost light may be obtained concerning the ethics of war and violence, there should be the widest possible discussion of this vital theme in the religious press, in the pulpit, in the class room, and in the private conversations of Christian people. The hope of the present writer is that the following chapters may, in some small way, stimulate discussion of this important subject. He admits freely that it is possible he may be mistaken in some of his conclusions. The convictions herein recorded are, however, the result of several years continuous thought and study and represent an almost complete reversal of opinions held prior to his experience overseas.

This volume is reprinted in the Christianity and Industry Series because the fundamental principles of Jesus' way of life apply equally to war between nations and war between classes.

KIRBY PAGE.

February 1, 1922.

311 Division Avenue,

Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I: THE OTHER SIDE OF WAR.....	11
II: IS THE JUDGMENT OF THE MAJORITY INFALLIBLE?.....	17
III: DID JESUS EVER FACE A WAR SITUATION?.....	26
IV: WHAT JESUS TAUGHT CONCERNING WAR.....	32
V: THE SUPREMACY AND PRACTICABILITY OF THE WAY OF THE CROSS	39
VI: THE ONLY SURE WAY TO ABOLISH WAR.....	46

THE SWORD OR THE CROSS

I: THE OTHER SIDE OF WAR

I

Since August, 1914, countless speeches have been made and millions of pages written on the subject of war. Throughout the whole of this discussion there has been a tendency to emphasize the facts on one side and to ignore or suppress the facts on the other side. While the war lasted this attitude was quite natural and almost inevitable. Morale depended upon it.

In the Allied countries the emphasis was: This is the war to destroy autocracy, to make the world safe for democracy, to restore the sanctity of treaties, to redeem Belgium, to right ancient wrongs, to save civilization; words are inadequate to describe the wonderful spirit of our fighting men, their courage, their endurance, their devotion, their cheerfulness, their unselfishness, their willingness to make the supreme sacrifice.

Little was said about the other side of war. Vigilant censors saw to it that no emphasis was placed here. Letters were delivered with paragraphs deleted, objectionable newspapers and periodicals were suppressed, books were confiscated, speakers were warned, silenced or imprisoned. Morale had to be sustained.

By the time the armistice was signed and the censorship relaxed, people were tired of war news of any sort. The prevalent attitude has been: Now that the war is over, let us forget about it as soon as we can. Newspapers and periodicals sensed the situation and printed less and less war news.

The homecoming of the victorious troops increased this emphasis of one side of war. Triumphal arches were erected. Mobs lined the boulevards and cheered themselves speechless as the scarred veterans marched by. The glory of war was at its height. Veterans home from the front, in their public addresses and private conversations, very naturally placed chief emphasis upon the nobler phases of the war. They hesitated to say much about the other side of war. The War Department and defense societies have continued their propaganda to emphasize one side of war. They have said little about the other side.

A noticeable result of this one-sided emphasis is to be observed in the present attitude of children and young people toward war. In the minds of the youth of this country there is no horror of war. War to them is grand and glorious. They incorporate it into their games. They revel in it.

Sufficient emphasis has not been placed upon the other side of war.¹ There is another side to war. And what is the other side? Ask the man who knows—the man who went over the top, the machine gunner, the heavy artillery-man, the bombing pilot, the spy, the diplomat, the surgeon, the nurse, the chaplain. Now that the war is over these persons who know the other side from personal experience should tell the whole story. The present writer can only pass on certain impressions that came to him during the experience of eight months overseas.

II

The true story of the other side of war will include an emphasis upon the following:

The immediate objective in battle is to kill and destroy. The weapons of war are bayonets, machine guns, siege guns, poison gas, boiling oil, bombing planes, battleships, submarines, blockades.

Certain of these weapons are so new that their use is questioned by some of the more timid folk. War Departments, however, with more discernment, have seen that there are no essential differences among them.

Since the objective in war is to kill and destroy, why quibble over the mere detail as to whether a man is to be suffocated by asphyxiation or by drowning? What difference does it make to the victim whether he is bayoneted or boiled? Wherein is drowning less painful because the boat was sunk by a battleship rather than by a submarine? Do little children die a more horrible death from a Zeppelin's bomb than from starvation as a result of a blockade?

The War Departments, at least, have faced the facts. No faint-heartedness has prevented them from making use of any available weapon of destruction. If poison gas and boiling oil are more efficacious at times than bayonets and grenades, use them. What difference does it make to the victim?

Let us take a closer look at these weapons.

Bayonets have long been recognized as a standard weapon of

¹ When this was written the realistic portrayal of war by Will Irwin, Philip Gibbs and Frederick Palmer had not appeared.

warfare. The purpose of a bayonet is to kill or cripple. Sometimes the victim is plunged through the abdomen and his bowels come gushing out; sometimes it is his lung or his heart that is punctured; it may be his eye that is gouged out; or perhaps he is only stunned and falls unconscious to the earth, to be trampled to death under the avalanche of oncoming feet.

Machine guns and siege guns are likewise old and highly honored weapons. Their purpose is to kill, cripple or destroy. Machine guns are most effective when the enemy attacks in mass formation. Under favorable circumstances a machine gun crew may kill or cripple several hundred men a minute. Siege guns have a range up to seventy miles. At this distance, or even at five miles, the gunners cannot be accurate. They are just as likely to hit a cathedral as an arsenal, a hospital as a barracks, a school house as a railway station. Siege guns are also effective in terrifying the inhabitants.

Boiling oil and poison gas are new weapons, but soon after their introduction by Germany, they were in general use by the Allies. Thousands of the enemy may be asphyxiated in a few moments. Sometimes the victim dies immediately; in other cases, he is blinded for life.

The possibilities of the use of boiling oil are less extensive, but under certain conditions it is a highly successful instrument. Let an eyewitness describe its effects: "The enemy in dense formation, believing themselves safe, gave battle as was expected. Then there occurred the very event which was anticipated. Over one thousand gallons of boiling oil burst forth from special engines and enclosed in its circle of fire the wily and terrified Germans. Yells of despair rose for a moment from the sunken road, but the barrage fire redoubling made all action impossible. A deadly silence soon fell upon the heap of carbonized humanity, coupled with an odor of roasted flesh which marked the German charnel house."

III

Air raids over cities removed from the fighting front are now a regular feature of warfare. Terrible destruction is wrought; men, women and children are slaughtered indiscriminately. The present writer has witnessed at close range many such raids over London and Folkestone. It is hellish business!

The blockade has long been an important feature of warfare. Its advantages are that it not only deprives the enemy of muni-

tions of warfare, it weakens the whole population by lack of proper food. If continued sufficiently long it may cause the death of thousands through malnutrition and starvation. It reaches the whole population. In the recent war more people were starved to death through the blockade than were drowned by all the submarines or blown to pieces in all of the air raids. The blockade is also effective in that it leaves a permanent mark on the enemy, through vast numbers of emaciated, anemic and tubercular children and young people.

Before our moral and intellectual faculties were benumbed by the vast losses of the recent war, we were unanimous in denouncing air raids over defenseless cities and unrestricted submarine warfare as terrible atrocities. Our first judgment was sound. *They are atrocities.* And so are the other acts of warfare. War itself is the mother atrocity. These individual acts are only the natural offspring of a prolific parent.

That the end justifies the means is the fundamental philosophy of war. No sane man denies the horrors and brutalities of war. Plunging a bayonet of steel into quivering human flesh, mowing men down with a machine gun as wheat before a scythe, blinding men with gas, boiling men with oil, mangling women and children with bombs, drowning the helpless, starving the innocent, these are everywhere recognized as unspeakably horrible.

And yet they are an essential part of war. Men abhor these practices. They sanction and participate in them because the end justifies the means. The law of military necessity holds sway. Do whatever is necessary in order to win.

Obedience to superiors is the cornerstone of military efficiency. The soldier is not free to make choices in the light of his own moral judgment; his primary duty is to execute the decisions of his superiors. He cannot question the judgment of his superior officers, nor can he follow his own conscience with regard to any practice. Compunctions of conscience must not be allowed to interfere with the most explicit obedience of orders. The command given may involve the use of poison gas, the sinking of the Lusitania, the bombing of London or Cologne, or the shooting down of relatives upon the streets of Dublin. The military authorities are the sole judges as to the morality of these acts; the soldier simply executes their decision.

When a soldier does that which he is commanded to do, in direct opposition to his own moral judgment, he surrenders his moral freedom. This surrender is necessary to success in war.

No one doubts that war makes human life very cheap. But, as Fosdick points out, there is a great difference between physical

life and personality. The charge against war is that it tends to destroy the value of both physical life and personality.

A soldier not only loses his individuality, he is lost sight of as a person. He becomes a mere cog in the great war machine. When the General Staff calmly vote to spend a quarter or a half million lives in order to capture a given point, they do so because they do not look upon their soldiers as persons. Soldiers are pawns to be moved about or sacrificed at the option of the commander.

This fact is brought out in a letter from an officer, which Fosdick quotes: "An enemy mine exploded here a few days ago and buried our brigade. Many of the men were killed, but some were not much hurt, so we dug them out and used them over again." Fosdick then remarks, "Sons of God and brothers of Jesus Christ—dug them out and used them over again!" That is war."

Not only does the soldier become a mere cog in the war machine, he in turn loses the sense of the value of the enemy's personality. Coningsby Dawson, who writes of the war from a high moral and spiritual viewpoint, bears eloquent testimony at this point: "It seems brutal to say it, but taking potshots at the enemy when they present themselves is rather fun. When you watch them scattering like ants before the shell whose direction you have ordered, you somehow forget to think of them as individuals."

When a man fires fifty thousand rounds from a heavy gun into the ranks of the enemy, as was the case with one man of whom the present writer knew, he ceases to regard Germans as persons; they become mere targets.

IV

How can a man keep his reverence for personality in the midst of such a scene as this? "Every weapon for the slaughter of men, from the heaviest of high explosives to boiling oil and gas shells, was let loose upon them in one great tempest of destruction, which blew them out of the earth, and frizzled them, and blinded them, and choked them."

To round out the picture, we quote the words of a young officer: "It is hideously exasperating to hear people talking the glib commonplaces about the war and distributing cheap sympathy to its victims. Perhaps you are tempted to give them a picture of a leprous earth, scattered with the swollen and blackening corpses of hundreds of young men. The appalling stench of rotting carrion, mingled with the sickening smell of exploded lyddite and ammonal. Mud like porridge, trenches like shallow and sloping

cracks in the porridge—porridge that stinks in the sun. Swarms of flies and blue-bottles clustering on pits of offal. Wounded men lying in the shell holes among the decaying corpses, helpless under the scorching sun and bitter nights, under repeated shelling. Men with bowels dropping out, lungs shot away, with blinded, smashed faces, or limbs blown into space. Men screaming and gibbering. Wounded men hanging in agony on the barbed wire, until a friendly spout of liquid fire shrivels them up like a fly in the candle."

This is the other side of war.

This is not what some may think war *ought to be*. This is what war *actually is*. In the recent war, as in all others, the charge was made that the enemy waged inhuman and uncivilized warfare. The humanization and civilization of war! One might as well speak of the virtue of vice, the tenderness of atrocity, the reverence of sacrilege, the innocence of guilt, the truth of falsehood, the freedom of slavery!

"O war," exclaims Harry Emerson Fosdick, "I hate you most of all because you lay your hands upon the finest qualities in human life, qualities that rightly used would make a heaven on earth, and you use them to make a hell on earth instead. You take our spirit of courage and devotion, and instead of letting it be a benediction in the world, you use it to burn cities and sack cathedrals and slay men. You take our loyalty that well used would redeem the world, and you harness it to a movement that inevitably means the rape of women, the murder of children, and the starvation of whole populations. You take our religion, and to help your deadly work you rend our God in pieces and make of him a score of tribal deities to whom men pray, as old barbarians, before our Lord had come, prayed to their idols as the gods of war. You take our science, the fruit of our dedicated intelligence, and you make even of that an effective minister of hate. This is the deepest charge against you, that you take our noblest powers and prostitute them to destructive ends."

II: IS THE JUDGEMENT OF THE MAJORITY INFALLIBLE?

I

Eight years ago it was generally supposed that the church was opposed to war. It was—in theory. It remained so, until Kaiser and Czar, King and President, made declarations of war and mobilized their fighting men. Then it did what it has consistently done for a thousand years. It threw itself unreservedly into the struggle on the side of the nation in which it was operating.

Protestants in Germany were loyal to Kaiser and Fatherland. Protestants in England were loyal to King and Empire, Roman Catholics in Austria willingly gave possessions and life for country, Roman Catholics in France counted no sacrifice too great to make for the homeland.

As a noted English divine points out: "On the eve of the greatest European war, organized Christianity lifted hardly a finger to avert it. On the outbreak of it, it was at once ready to assure every country concerned that its participation in it was right. War in general may be wrong, perhaps; but this particular war, so long as it lasts, is always right and always equally so for both sides."

It is no less an authority than Lecky who reminds us: "In looking back with our present experience, we are driven to the melancholy conclusion that not only has ecclesiastical influence had no appreciable influence in diminishing the number of wars, but that it has actually and very seriously increased it. We may look in vain for any period since Constantine, in which the clergy as a whole, as a body, exerted themselves to repress the military spirit or to prevent or abridge a particular war. . . With the exception of Mohammedanism, no other religion has done so much to produce war as was done by the religious teachers of Christendom during several centuries."

In similar tone is the testimony of Westermarck: "As a matter of fact, it would be impossible to find a single instance of a war waged by a Protestant country, from any motive, to which the bulk of its clergy have not given their sanction and support. The

opposition has generally come from other quarters. The orthodox are still of the same opinion as Sir James Turner, who declared that 'those who condemn the profession or art of soldiery, smell rank of Anabaptism or Quakery'; and war is in our days, as it was in those of Erasmus, so much sanctioned by authority and custom that it is deemed impious to bear testimony against it."

Thus we find a good precedent for the bitter persecution and imprisonment of men, who, on grounds of religion and conscience, refused to participate in the Great World War.

With a unanimity rarely equaled on any subject, the members of the various branches of the church in all lands and in all centuries since the days of Constantine, have sanctioned and participated in war. This is the fact. The query we desire to raise is this: *Can it be that the church has been wrong in holding this attitude toward war?*

Almost instinctively we are inclined to answer in the negative. Surely the vast majority of Christian people, including the most learned and the most devout, cannot be mistaken on so vital a moral issue. This seems to be almost inconceivable.

It may be of help to us in considering this question if we review briefly the historic record of the church on certain great moral issues.

II

Let us consider the historic attitude of the church toward freedom of thought and expression. The record is most distressing. For a thousand years the church tried by every conceivable means to compel men to adhere to the teaching and doctrines of the ecclesiastical authorities. This teaching was not confined to specifically religious questions, but sought to cover the whole of life. Theologians were as dogmatic in matters of astronomy, geology, geography, chemistry, physics, medicine and history, as in matters of church doctrine and polity.

The Roman Catholic church and all branches of the Protestant church vied with each other in denouncing the Copernican theory as contrary to Scripture. It was declared that "this pretended discovery vitiates the whole Christian plan of salvation." Father Leczee insisted that "it casts suspicion on the doctrines of the incarnation." Father Melchior Inchofer declared that "the opinion of the earth's motion is of all heresies the most abominable, the most pernicious, the most scandalous; the immovability of the earth is thrice sacred; arguments against the immortality of the soul, the existence of God, and the incarnation, should be tolerated sooner than an argument to prove that the earth moves."

Because he persisted in his belief in and proclamation of this hated heresy, Giordano Bruno was driven from land to land, imprisoned for six years in the horrible dungeons of the Inquisition at Rome, and finally burned alive. The late President Andrew D. White of Cornell filled two large volumes with instances where men of science were persecuted by the church because they dared to differ with the ecclesiastical authorities.

Ecclesiastical persecution was not confined to men of science. Heresy of any sort whatsoever was persecuted with relentless zeal. A single historian has devoted nine massive volumes to an enumeration of instances of the persecution of heretics by the church in various lands throughout many centuries.

For several hundred years the church resorted to every known means of torture in the punishment of heretics. Henry Charles Lea has described the lightest of penalties allowed by the Councils of Narbonne, Beziers, and Tarragona, in the thirteenth century: "It was no light matter. Stripped as much as decency and the inclemency of the weather would permit, the penitent presented himself every Sunday, with a rod in his hand, to the priest engaged in celebrating mass, who soundly scourged him in the presence of the congregation, as a fitting interlude in the mysteries of divine service."

A heavier penalty was imprisonment. Darkness, silence, loneliness, starvation and torture often worked wonders in saving heretics from the error of their ways. Speed was not a characteristic of ecclesiastical trials. We are told that "three, five or ten years are common enough as intervals between the first audience of a prisoner and his final conviction, nor are instances wanting of even greater delays. Bernalde, wife of Guillem de Montaigu, was imprisoned at Toulouse in 1297, and made a confession the same year, yet she was not formally sentenced to imprisonment until 1310. Guillem Garric was brought to confess at Carcassonne in 1321, after a detention of nearly thirty years."

If all other means failed, there was only one further thing to do, to burn the heretic at the stake. This was done with dreadful frequency. Even if we discount heavily the figures given by Llorente, the toll still remains at an appalling figure. Llorente gives the number of executions by the Inquisition as 341,042.

It was not until 1834 that the Inquisition was finally abolished in Spain.

III

This persecution of heretics was not confined to the Roman Catholic church. Almost every branch of the Protestant church

had its share in putting to death those who differed from the accepted doctrines of that church. As late as 1659, when two Quakers, Wm. Robinson and Marmaduke Stevenson, were hanged for heresy, the New England clergyman, John Wilson, stood by the gallows and railed at them.

In 1643, Sir Wm. Berkeley, Royal Governor of Virginia, strove by whippings and brandings to make the inhabitants of that colony conform to the Established Church.

The Protestant persecution of those accused of witchcraft is well known. On the continent, in England and Scotland, in New England, thousands of men and women were burned at the stake or put to death in some other manner on this charge. In Scotland an execution for witchcraft took place as late as 1722. In 1687 an eighteen-year-old boy named Hikenhead was accused of heresy and hanged in Edinburgh.

Let us remember that the leaders in this persecution of men of science, witches and heretics in general, were not, for the most part, rogues and scoundrels. They were often the most learned and most devout leaders in the various branches of the church.

Concerning the bull of Pope Innocent VIII., ordering the slaying of all witches, President White says: "Of all documents ever issued from Rome, imperial or papal, this has doubtless, first and last, cost the greatest shedding of innocent blood. Yet no document was ever more clearly dictated by conscience. It was based upon various texts of Scripture, especially upon the famous statement, 'Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live.'"

John Wesley is universally recognized as one of the greatest Christians of all time, yet he gave his sanction to the persecution of witches, saying: "Unless witchcraft is true, nothing in the Bible is true."

Cotton Mather was the outstanding persecutor of witches in the American colonies, yet his biographer tells us: "Cotton Mather had on the whole a noble character. He believed strongly in the power of prayer; his spiritual nature was high strung and delicate. He was remarkable for his godliness, his enthusiasm for knowledge and his prodigious memory. He published more than four hundred works."

Francis Xavier, the Apostle to the Indies, once replied to a friend who sought to dissuade him from entering the Eastern Archipelago, "They will kill me by poison, you say. I dare to say whatever form of torture awaits me, I am ready to suffer it ten thousand times for the salvation of a single soul." Yet it was this same saint who wrote to the King of Portugal: "The second need which India has in order that those who live in it

may be good Christians is that your Highness should send the Holy Inquisition."

After having made a lifelong study of the Inquisition and the persecution of heretics, the historian Lea expresses himself in these words: "There is no doubt that men of the kindest tempers, the profoundest intelligence, the noblest aspirations, the purest zeal for righteousness, professing a religion founded on love and charity, were ruthless when heresy was concerned, and were ready to trample it out at the cost of any suffering."

IV

Now let us consider the attitude of the church toward human slavery. The testimony at this point is not consistent. There are periods when the church was overwhelmingly opposed to slavery. There are other periods when great branches of the church were united in upholding it. Let us consider one of these latter periods.

During the first half of the nineteenth century the churches of the South were united in defending slavery. Wm. Goodell, in his "Slavery and Anti-Slavery," fills seventy-two pages with resolutions by various church bodies and statements from outstanding leaders in all denominations upholding the institution of slavery.

In 1840, the Rev. James Smylie said: "If the buying, selling and holding of a slave for the sake of gain is a heinous sin and scandal, then verily three-fourths of all the Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians, in eleven States of the Union, are of the devil. They hold, if they do not buy and sell, slaves."

The attitude of church leaders toward slavery is reflected in the following notice which appeared in a South Carolina paper: "On the first day of February next will be put up at public auction, before the court-house, the following property, belonging to the estate of the late Rev. Dr. Furman, viz.: A plantation or tract of land on and in Wateree Swamp; a tract of the first quality of fine land on the waters of Black River; a lot of land on the town of Camden; a library of miscellaneous character, chiefly theological; 27 Negroes, some of them very prime, two mules, one horse, and an old wagon."

The following quotation from a letter written by J. Cable, appearing in *The Mercier Luminary*, sheds still further light upon the attitude of the church toward slavery: "The worst kind of slavery is jobbing slavery, that is, the hiring out of slaves from year to year. What shocked me more than anything else was

that the church engaged in this jobbing business. The college church which I attended, and which was attended by all the students of Hamilton Sydney College and Union Theological Seminary (Va.) held slaves enough to pay their pastor, Mr. Stanton, one thousand dollars a year. The slaves, who had been left to the church by some pious mother in Israel, had increased so as to be a large and still increasing fund. They were hired out on Christmas day of each year, the day in which they celebrate the birth of our blessed Saviour, to the highest bidder. There were four other churches near the college church that supported the pastor, in whole or in part, in the same way."

V

As incredible as it may sound to modern ears, missionaries in the home field and abroad were numbered among the slaveholders. Mr. and Mrs. Davenport, missionaries to Siam, were not the only foreign missionaries who were slaveholders. "The American Baptist Home Missionary Society had in its employ as missionaries twenty-six slaveholders. As the missionary of this society, Mr. Tryon, entered Texas, he drove his slaves before him."

The following statement reveals the extremes to which certain clergymen went: "In 1841, the Rev. Jonathan Davis, a Baptist clergyman from Georgia, boasted that he was the owner of thirty human beings, and that he would wade knee-deep in blood to defend his rights to hold them."

Even the most learned and the most devout of Christian leaders joined in the chorus of approval of human slavery. The famous evangelist Whitefield said: "As to the lawfulness of keeping slaves, I have no doubt. I should think myself highly favored if I could purchase a goodly number of them, in order to make their lives comfortable, and lay a foundation for breeding up their posterity in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

One of the greatest leaders of the church during the first half of the nineteenth century was Alexander Campbell. In a letter to the editor of the *Edinburgh Journal*, dated Dundee, 21st August, 1847, he said: "I could as soon become a Socialist, or Free Thinker, or a Skeptic, as say or think that it is immoral or unChristian to hold a bond-servant in any case whatever. I therefore dare not, with my Bible in my hand, join in the anti-slavery crusade against the relation of master and slave."

A pamphlet circulated among the members of the Presbyterian General Assembly, said to have been written by Professor Hodge

of Princeton, says: "At the time of the advent of Jesus Christ, slavery in its worst forms prevailed over the world. The Saviour found it around him in Judea, the Apostles met with it in Asia, Greece and Italy. How did they treat it? Not by the denunciation of slaveholding as necessarily sinful. The assumption that slaveholding is in itself a crime, is not only an error, but it is an error fraught with evil consequences.

As to the sincerity and conscientiousness of those who upheld slavery, the eminent church historian, Leonard W. Bacon says: "The common sentiment of southern Christianity was expressed in that serious declaration of the Southern Presbyterian church during the war, of its 'deep conviction of the divine appointment of domestic servitude' and of the 'peculiar mission of the southern church to conserve the institution of slavery.'"

VI

Next, let us consider the historic attitude of the church toward the liquor traffic. Concerning the New England Puritans of the eighteenth century, Daniel Dorchester says: "The drinking habits of all classes, ministers included, hung like a dead-weight upon the churches. Ordinations were seasons of festivity, in which copious drinking had a large share. Not very far from the Revolution, several councils were held in one of the towns of Massachusetts, where the people were trying to get rid of a minister who was often the worse for liquor, even in the pulpit, and once, at least, at the communion table; but some of the neighboring ministers stood by him, and the people had to endure him till his death."

Theodore Parker bears similar testimony: "It is recorded in the probate office that, in 1678, at the funeral of Mrs. Mary Norton, widow of the celebrated John Norton, one of the ministers of the First Church in Boston, fifty-one gallons and a half of the best Malago wine were consumed by the mourners. Affairs came to such a pass that, in 1742, the general court of Massachusetts forbade the use of wine and rum at funerals."

The Rev. Leonard Wood, D.D., gives us this startling information: "I remember when I could reckon up among my acquaintances forty ministers, and none of them at a great distance, who were either drunkards or far addicted to drinking. I could mention an ordination which took place about twenty years ago (1816) at which I myself was ashamed and grieved to see two aged ministers literally drunk, and a third indecently excited."

A correspondent of a Boston newspaper wrote: "A great many deacons in New England die drunkards. I have a list of 123 intemperate deacons in Massachusetts, 43 of whom became sots."

During the early days of the temperance movement in the United States the bulk of the clergy were bitterly opposed to it. Sermons were preached, books and pamphlets written, proving that the liquor traffic was sanctioned by the Bible and Jesus Christ.

After seventeen years of vigorous opposition to the temperance movement, the Rev. Joseph C. Lovejoy wrote a book entitled, "Prohibition Ground to Powder," in which he said: "I have never flinched nor doubted; not one pang of remorse or regret. I told the truth in vindication of God's word and Christ's example; and in defense of the personal rights of every human being. The assailants are at war with God and man."

VII

Surely there is no need to summon further witnesses. The facts are too numerous and unmistakable to leave any doubt as to the errors of judgment on the part of the Church. Let us keep clearly in mind that many of the leaders of the Inquisition, the defenders of human slavery and the liquor traffic, were entirely conscientious in their attitude and conduct. In his "History of Civilization in England," Buckle says: "It is an undoubted fact that an overwhelming majority of religious persecutors have been men of the purest intentions, of the most admirably unsullied morals. Such men as these are not bad, they are only ignorant."

The errors of the Church in the past are not proof that the Church is wrong in its present attitude toward war. The facts in the case and the arguments advanced are, however, sufficient to cause us to raise the question: Is the Church wrong in sanctioning and participating in war?

Is it possible that the historian of another century will look back upon the present attitude of the Church toward war with the same degree of amazement that we look back upon the defense, upon Biblical grounds, of human slavery, the liquor traffic and the persecution of heretics?

To guard against any possible misunderstanding of the present writer's attitude toward the Church, it should be stated that he believes heartily in the Church. It is his conviction that the Church, having once become aware of its errors concerning freedom of thought, human slavery and the liquor traffic, has been

one of the mightiest factors in extending education and making possible freedom of thought, in the abolition of human slavery, and in the destruction of the liquor traffic.

The writer of these paragraphs has gone through the painful process of reviewing certain glaring errors of the Church in the past because he is profoundly convinced that the Church is making a similar error in its present defense of war as a means of achieving a righteous end, and because he believes that once the Church sees its error in this regard and turns resolutely away from war as a method, it will be the mightiest factor in destroying war and in substituting really Christian ways of settling international differences.

The present writer is grieved at what he believes to be the error of the Church in defending war because without the aid of the Church he sees no hope whatever of abolishing war.

III: DID JESUS EVER FACE A WAR SITUATION?

I

The answer to this very important question will enable us better to understand the attitude of Jesus toward war. What are the facts in the case?

In the time of Jesus, Palestine was a conquered province of the Roman Empire. Jerusalem was the chief defense of a strategic system of fortifications which extended throughout the country. Roman soldiers and mercenaries from Galatia, Germany and Thrace were placed in all fortresses, and foreign ministers and retainers were constantly coming and going from the royal residence. Roman centurions are often mentioned in the New Testament.

The Roman authorities were entrusted with full military and judicial powers, and heavy taxes were imposed upon the people. The representatives of Rome also had full power over the Jewish Sanhedrin, and one procurator, Valerius Gratus, changed the High Priest four times within four years. In the year A. D. 19, Tiberius, after drafting four thousand Jews of the dispersion into the Roman Army, banished the entire Jewish colony from the Imperial City.

Every effort was put forth to impart Roman ideals and culture to the Jews. Splendid heathen temples were erected. Roman theaters and amphitheaters were built; military roads were studded with Roman monuments; towns and public edifices received Roman names; chariot races, gladiatorial combats and wild beast fights could be witnessed in the very heart of Judaism.

Pontius Pilate was procurator in Judæa during the active ministry of Jesus. Concerning his rule, the historian, Professor Graetz, says: "As soon as Pontius Pilate was in power he showed determination to subject the Judeans to further humiliation and to convince them that they must drink the cup of suffering to the dregs. He certainly went beyond any of his predecessors in wound-

DID JESUS EVER FACE A WAR SITUATION? 27

ing the susceptibilities of the Judean nation. He attacked their religious scruples by endeavoring to induce them to pay homage to the emblem and insignia of imperialism."

In this connection, Dr. Lyman Abbott says: "The throne of David was occupied by the creature of a foreign country, sustained by the arms of a foreign soldiery. The guards against monarchical usurpation which the Mosaic constitution had provided were swept away. The popular right of suffrage was long since lost in the universal wreck, and with it the popular representative bodies which Moses had constituted. A military despotism was substituted for the free commonwealth. Even the form of national life did not survive the Herodian dynasty. At Herod's death, while Christ was still an infant, Palestine was divided into petty provinces and placed under the control of Roman governors, who under different names fulfilled substantially the same function. The whole civil government was administered by them. All capital cases were brought before them for adjudication. The high-priest was appointed and removed at their pleasure. Their will was absolute law. From their decisions there was, except in the case of Roman citizens, no appeal. At the command of Herod, the infant children of Bethlehem were slain without reason and without resistance (Matt. 2:16-18). At the command of Pontius Pilate the Galileans gathered for the sacrifice were massacred on their own altars (Luke 13:1). In every principal town the Roman soldiery were quartered and the Roman centurion, answering to our captain of infantry, reigned, a petty and therefore intolerable despot. Some ruins of the Mosaic tribunals indeed remained. In every synagogue was a local court; in every city a larger tribunal; while at Jerusalem the Sanhedrin, instituted in the wilderness and reinstated under the Maccabees, continued to hold its sessions. Very little jurisdiction, however, was left to them, save in ecclesiastical questions. They were powerless to protect the people from the exactions and oppressions of the foreigners. For the most part all important cases of a civil and criminal nature were determined by the Roman military authorities, who, irresponsible save to their superior officers, meted out, as may be supposed, a very irregular kind of justice. They were flagrantly corrupt."

II

During the days of Jesus there was peace in Palestine—the kind of peace which comes when a powerful nation has completely conquered a weaker one, and then condescends to grant to it a

greater or lesser measure of freedom and self-government under paternal imperial supervision. At any moment Rome could have taken away Israel's remnant of political freedom. The Roman rule was much sterner and more galling during the days just before Jesus was born and just after he died than during his lifetime. But the cruel persecution of the Roman conquerors immediately preceding and succeeding the ministry of Jesus is a clear indication of the summary punishment that would have been meted out to any who should have resisted Roman authority. So long as the Jews were willing to submit to the Roman yoke they could have peace.

If Germany had conquered Belgium, and some years later, while reserving the power of taxation and the appointing of political and ecclesiastical officials in Belgium, had granted a liberal measure of local self-government, political conditions would have been similar to those of Palestine in the days of Jesus.

Restless under this tyranny, the Jewish people were eagerly awaiting the coming of the Messiah, who should overthrow the conqueror and bring about freedom. "Son of David is the most characteristic, as it is the most traditional and historic, designation of the Jewish Messiah. It expressed the most representative type of the Messianic expectation. Palestine was ready to respond to any bold or able adventurer like Judas, Theudas or Bar Cochba, the last of whom was supported even by the distinguished Rabbi Akiba."

"This indirect evidence afforded by the Psalms of Solomon," says Professor E. F. Scott, "is borne out by the express words of Philo in a passage which evidently reflects the prevailing Jewish belief in his time. 'According to the prophets a man will appear who wages war and conquers powerful nations, while God sends the needed help to his saint.' Above all, we have unmistakable testimony in the numerous popular tumults, half-religious and half-political, which took place in the time of the Roman procurators. Our chief authority for the state of popular feeling in the time of Christ is the New Testament itself. We can gather from every page of the Gospels that the period was one of intense excitement. The religious leaders found it impossible to restrain the ardor of the people, who were waiting everywhere for the appearance of the promised Deliverer. This mood of expectancy had no doubt been heightened by the events of recent history. For more than a generation past the Romans had been encroaching on Jewish freedom and their measures of repression had stirred the spirit of patriotism to fiercer life. To the people at large the Messiah remained what he had been to Isaiah and his

contemporaries—the Son of David who would bring victory and prosperity to the Jewish nation.”

In this connection, Dean Shailer Mathews says: “The term ‘Son of David’ had become expressive of the entire Messianic idea as held by all Jews, whether scribes or common people. It indicated that the new kingdom was to be essentially Jewish, just as its king was to be representative of the most typical royal family of Hebrew history. More than that, it declared the new kingdom to be essentially military, for to the Jew, David was essentially a man of war, a conqueror of the enemies of Israel. To describe the Messianic King as his son was to ascribe to him the same military prowess.”

III

“What business had the Roman in Palestine,” asks Dr. Alfred Edersheim, “how dared the idolater profane by his presence the sacred soil that was God’s; how could he claim to rule the people whose sole king was Jehovah of the mighty arm and outstretched hand? Even to admit it as a fact, nay to tolerate it, was an act of unfaithfulness to God, of deep unbelief, of apostasy. So patriotism and religion—both in abnormal forms—mingled. They whetted their daggers to the sound of psalms, and sharpened their swords to the martial music of the prophetic utterances, which to them seemed only denunciations and imprecations on the enemy.”

In like tenor, Dr. Burris A. Jenkins says: “The cry ‘The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand!’ was as startling to Jerusalem as ‘The Revolution is here!’ was to Paris in 1793. The Hebrew people were as ready to unsheath swords, pull up paving-stones, and build barricades in behalf of the new Kingdom, as the French were in behalf of liberty, equality and fraternity. It was no new word, this ‘Kingdom of Heaven.’ It had long been on the lips of peasant and prophet, herdsmen and statesmen, fishermen and rabbis. It was electric with preparation, dynamic with memories, charged with desperation, longing, hope deferred.”

It was this expectation that caused them to flock around John the Baptist and to listen so eagerly to his message concerning the imminent coming of the Kingdom of Heaven. It was this same hope that later caused them to spread their garments in the path of Jesus and to cry out: “Hosanna to the Son of David.” Surely Israel was about to be restored to her former freedom and magnificence; yes, even the glories of David and Solomon were to be surpassed under the leadership of the Messiah.

It was into this atmosphere that Jesus came. His country was in disgraceful bondage to imperialistic and militaristic Rome. His countrymen were waiting with intense eagerness for the Messiah, who should lead them to victory and freedom and glory. Jesus claimed to be the Messiah. Multitudes crowded about him and applauded him as the long expected One, the Son of David, the Deliverer.

IV

In the presence of this need, under the pressure of this demand, impelled by his own inner call, what should he do? Yes, Jesus faced the question of war. He faced it with a degree of earnestness and intensity never surpassed.

One of the great temptations of his life came at this point. Concerning the third temptation of Jesus, when "the devil taketh him to a high mountain," Dr. Lyman Abbott says: "This last temptation was the subtlest, and therefore the most dangerous of all. In the midst of a ruined world stands Jesus, the mournful spectator of its woes. His pure soul is disgusted by the heartless ritualism of a degenerate religion. His patriotism is wounded and grieved by his nation's present decay and impending doom. He feels the weight of the Roman yoke. He shudders at the impiety of Roman polytheism. He loathes and detests the odious oppression which is wearing out the life of his people. He has felt himself irresistibly to be the ransom first of his own nation, then also the oppressed nationalities of the earth. He has proposed within himself to found a kingdom whose law shall be liberty, whose fruit shall be peace. He recognized that in the Jewish nation and in the Jewish religion are the elements out of which this kingdom is to be constructed. He finds a religious party expectant of a Messiah, anxious for a Messiah, and ready to cast the whole weight of their prestige and influence in with any one who gives promise of restoring to the nation its ancient glory and will suffer them to be sharers in it.

"For the establishment of such a kingdom, Christ had many advantages. He had the grace which attracts men, the eloquence which arouses their courage and which inspires them. A picture of a nation long enslaved, now disenthralled, restored, reformed, purified by his power—this is the picture the wily tempter presented to his imagination. Nor this alone. Alexander going forth from the little kingdom of Macedon, had vanquished the world. Already Greece had lost its vitality; already the power of Rome was passing away, although its apparent dominion was

at its height. To a devoutly enkindled imagination it would not seem impossible that the conditions of the present might be reversed in the future. The kingdoms of the earth might yet be subject to a redeemed and ransomed Israel. The Jewish people expected it. The prophets seemed to most of their readers to promise it. The kingdoms of the earth and all their glories were seen as in a vision."

What George D. Herron says in this connection is undoubtedly true: "There are indications that Jesus met, in temptations beyond our power of sympathy to interpret, the question of revolution. Civilization was a Roman dominion, making one vast, splendid, slave-pen of the earth, with suicide the only escape for fettered, crushed and despairing lives. Roman virtues had been terrible. But when these virtues were dissolving in still more terrible vices, the earth became the arena of unmitigated suffering, seeming like the creation of devils. Could anything prevail against this exhausted system, save the attack of forces of its own kind—forces it could understand?"

V

Jesus was face to face with a concrete situation similar in principle to that of Belgium in 1914. Germany invaded Belgium, Rome overran Palestine; Germany imposed heavy taxes on the Belgians, Rome did the same with the Jews; Germany shelled the great cathedral, Rome defiled the holy temple; the Germans murdered innocent Belgians, in this they were only following the example of Herod and Pilate. The issues at stake in Palestine in the days of Jesus and in Belgium in 1914 were similar in principle, namely, freedom versus bondage.

Shall I not respond to the appeal of my countrymen that I take up the sword and lead them against the Roman conqueror? Under the circumstances, are not violence and war the only available means of obtaining freedom? In what other way can the chosen people of God be delivered from bondage? Why not follow the warlike example of Joshua and David and Judas Maccabeus? Does not the end justify the means?

These are questions that Jesus faced.

IV: WHAT JESUS TAUGHT CONCERNING WAR

I

We are in a better position than ever before to discuss this question. We now know something about the realities of war. No longer do we have to theorize about it. Our war experiences are still vividly impressed upon our minds. Yet we are far enough removed from the actual struggle to reach a much truer judgment concerning the relation of war and the teaching of Jesus.

In such a study, it is hardly necessary to remind ourselves that the proof-text method offers little or no proof at all. It is only as we take the teaching of Jesus as a whole and observe its application in his own life, that we can catch his spirit and know his attitude toward war.

It should not be necessary to say that the Old Testament is not the final authority for the Christian. No one can read the two Testaments without noting the striking differences in spirit and attitude. As Dr. George H. Gilbert says: "When we pass from the Old Testament to the New, we leave war and battlefields behind us. Of Yahweh mighty in battle, Yahweh who is a 'man of war,' who strikes through kings in the day of his wrath; of Yahweh clad in warlike array, drawing out the spear, whetting the sword, and marching before the hosts of Israel to discomfit their enemies and his, we hear no more."

The Bible is a progressive revelation of God, and war must be judged by the higher revelation of Jesus and the New Testament, rather than by the former conception of David and the Old Testament.

II

Let us now note the specific passages which have a bearing upon our problem, noting first those verses which seem to show that Jesus sanctions war, and later the verses which show his condemnation of war.

The incident in the temple when Jesus used the scourge of small cords (John 2:13-17) is often cited as indicating Jesus' sanction of war. *The very most that can be said in this regard is that Jesus sanctions the use of force.* To say this is not proof that Jesus sanctions war. War involves many other factors than the mere use of force. If Jesus had used force in such a way as to give supremacy to military necessity, to destroy human life, to break down reverence for personality, to retaliate with evil for evil, to compel the surrender of his moral freedom, we might then well believe that he sanctions war. The use of force is one problem, the morality of war as a means to an end involves so many additional factors as to be quite a different problem. Each should be judged on its own merits.

In the second place, we find the verses, "I came not to send peace, but a sword" (Matt. 10:34), and "Let him sell his cloak and buy a sword" (Luke 22:36), which are used as proof that Jesus wanted his disciples to be prepared for war. To understand these verses, we must notice their context. If we turn to the verse in Matthew, we find that the very next verse reads: "For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law." If we take one verse literally, we should also take literally the verse which follows it. If one means that Jesus came to bring a literal sword, then the next means that he came as a great home-wrecker, setting the members thereof one against the other. Such a literal interpretation prevents any clear understanding of the words of Jesus. Surely his words, "I came not to send peace but a sword," mean that he came to bring about a sharp division between those who do right and those who do wrong. In Kent's translation of the New Testament, these words read: "I did not come to bring peace, but a struggle. For I came to make a man disagree with his father, a daughter with her mother, and a daughter-in-law with her mother-in-law." It is to be doubted if a single reputable Biblical scholar can be found who will interpret these words to mean that Jesus had reference to a literal sword as a means of accomplishing a desired end.

III

With reference to the passage in Luke, one has only to read the verses that follow to see that Jesus could not have meant these words as a sanction of war. "It was the last evening of Jesus' life—the hour of sharp crisis, both for him and for his disciples.

At an earlier day, in Galilee, he had sent them out on a gracious mission, without purse, or wallet, or shoes, and yet they had lacked nothing, for they found friends to supply all their needs. The case was soon to be greatly changed. He himself was about to be reckoned with transgressors, and surely his disciples would have to encounter bitter opposition. They must therefore be prepared, must be armed, must have 'swords.' Were there the slightest doubt regarding the correctness of this interpretation, it would be entirely dispelled by the sequel, for the disciples, promptly misunderstanding Jesus' reference to a sword, reminded him that they had two, and he replied, 'It is enough' (or according to Moffatt's translation, 'Enough! Enough!'). But, obviously, two swords were not enough to defend his life from his strong and determined foes; two swords were not enough for war. They were, however, enough, and even one was enough, to convey his thought of being prepared for the time of stress that was approaching." Professor Hastings Rashdall, the eminent theologian and philosopher, says, in this connection: "More probably the words were 'a piece of ironical foreboding,' which the disciples took literally. The 'it is enough' will then mean, 'Drop that idea: my words were not meant seriously.'"

The third reference is to Matthew 22:21 and to the 13th chapter of Romans. It is said that Jesus and St. Paul accepted the authority of the state, and since the state rests upon force and war, the Christian must likewise accept these. It is quite true that Jesus recognized the sphere of the state, in the statement, "Give Caesar what belongs to Caesar." He paid taxes and never renounced the authority of the state. But this is only a half-truth. He likewise said, "Give God what belongs to God," and "Seek ye first the kingdom of God."

St. Paul also upholds the state, especially in the thirteenth chapter of Romans. Upon close inspection of the teaching of St. Paul, however, the most that can be said in this connection is that the authority of the state is to be recognized and obeyed *in so far as it does not conflict with the higher law of God*. What are we to gather from the following words by St. Paul? "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of God: and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment. For rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. And wouldest thou have no fear of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise from the same: for he is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is

evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil."

IV

Let us remember that it was the emperor and officials of the Roman Empire of whom St. Paul was speaking. Can any one believe that St. Paul meant literally that all of these Roman officials were ministers of God for the benefit of the Christians and were to be obeyed as agents of divine vengeance? The officials of that empire, where there were three slaves for every citizen? That country in which slaves could not be legally married, unions between slaves being framed and dissolved at the will of the master? That empire which officially sanctioned gladiatorial combats, and pitted man against beast?

With this literal interpretation in mind, would we not be compelled to say that a later emperor of this same Roman Empire, Diocletian, was "a minister of God" when he issued an edict that he was to be worshipped as God, and when he not only burned the books of Holy Scripture and Christian houses of worship, but killed by slow torture many thousands of Christians who refused to worship him? Should St. Paul's words: "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God" have been taken literally by these Christians and should they have worshipped Diocletian as God? By this same literal interpretation, should not the Christians in Germany have obeyed the Kaiser, since "there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God," and have participated in the deporting and slaying of the innocent Belgians?

Such a strict and literal interpretation of this passage furnished in past days adequate grounds for the doctrine of the divine right of kings, and the theory, "the king can do no wrong."

If St. Paul meant his words to be taken thus literally, he and the other disciples failed utterly to live up to their own teaching. The New Testament is filled with instances where the disciples refused to obey the government authorities, and many times they were imprisoned for disobedience. When commanded by the officials to cease their Christian activity, they replied, "We must obey God rather than man."

As interpreted by the life of St. Paul and the other disciples, these verses in Romans mean that rulers and laws are necessary, and in so far as they are instruments of God they are to be obeyed. But when their commands are contrary to the spirit and

teaching of the Master, they are to be resisted even if it means the death of the disciple.

None of us believes that rulers are infallible or that their commands should constitute our highest standard of right and wrong. Quite apart from the belief of the ruler, the method of war is either Christian or un-Christian, and his command does not determine whether our participation in it is moral or immoral. Therefore, the Christian citizen must come to his decision on a basis of the spirit and teaching of Jesus, quite independently of the command of the ruler. To say that Jesus and St. Paul recognize the function of the state is not to say that they command the Christian to participate in war when ordered to do so by the ruler of the nation; any more than their recognition of the state meant that they sanctioned human slavery, polygamy, extortion and the other evil practices which were approved by the state.

V

We now turn to the positive teaching of Jesus against war. Although his teaching makes no direct reference to war as such, as it does not to human slavery and many notorious evils of his day, it does contain much that applies to the method of war. Some of the realities of war are: the law of military necessity, the end justifies the means, the wholesale destruction of life, the losing of reverence for personality, retaliation of evil for evil, the surrender of moral freedom. About these things the teaching of Jesus has much to say.

Under certain conditions, military necessity compels the adoption of methods of warfare without consideration of law or morality. *The final defence of war must always be that the end justifies the means.* No one denies the horrors of dropping bombs on cities and towns, the starving of civilian populations or the plunging of bayonet steel into human flesh. All Christian men freely admit that war is a survival of savagery and barbarism and is essentially unchristian. Men hate war, men use it—the end justifies the means.

The spirit and teaching of Jesus give us clear light regarding the validity of this conclusion for the Christian. Tertullian well says: "The life of faith knows no plea of necessity, for how can there be a necessity to sin, in a life the one necessity of which is that it does not sin."

To seek a noble end by improper means is to try to cast out satan by using satan's weapons. It seems impossible to conceive

of Jesus adopting war, which is universally acknowledged as a thing thoroughly bad in itself, as a means to an end, however noble that end might be. It is equally certain that he does not ask his followers to do a thing which he himself cannot do. The law of military necessity and the doctrine that the end justifies the means are clearly in violation of the whole spirit and teaching of Jesus.

War inevitably involves retaliation—evil for evil, battle for battle, poison gas for poison gas, liquid fire for liquid fire, air raid for air raid, starvation for starvation. No one can deny that this practice of returning evil for evil is directly opposed to the fundamental teaching of Jesus. The Sermon on the Mount is emphatic in its protest against retaliation. Jesus shows clearly that while retaliation was sanctioned in the former time—"an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth"—it is no longer permissible for his disciples. It is not necessary to be literalistic in interpreting his teaching about not resisting, turning the other cheek or going two miles, to discover the principle which he is setting forth. The Apostle Paul well summed up our Lord's teaching in this regard in the words: "Never pay back evil for evil to anyone."

VI

War decreases reverence for personality, it tears down what Christianity builds up. One of the outstanding differences between Christianity and other religions is the emphasis placed upon the value of human beings. More valuable than sparrows or sheep, more precious than the sum total of material possessions, are human beings. War makes life cheap. Jesus gives it priceless value.

War means that the individual must surrender his moral freedom. The soldier does not control his own actions, he must obey orders without regard to his own standard of ethics or morals. And this is clearly opposed to the teaching and spirit of Jesus. No military command can justify the setting aside of moral law. If a given act or practice is contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus it is wrong, and no military command can make it right. A man cannot surrender his moral freedom, pursue a course of action that is unchristian and at the same time be following the way of Jesus.

It is in the cross that we find the key of Christianity. Here we find Jesus' way of life, here we see love and vicarious service in the highest degree. Jesus calls his followers to live in this spirit and it is by this means that evil-doers are to be overcome. Jesus recognized that there would be a struggle between the wicked and the

righteous and he warned his disciples that lives would be lost. Whose lives? those of the wicked or of the righteous? Shall the guilty die at the hands of the innocent, or shall the innocent die for the guilty? It is at this point that the sword and the cross differ. The sword, used defensively, means the attempt to kill the guilty for the sake of the innocent. The cross symbolizes the willingness of the innocent to die for the guilty.

Jesus was compelled to refuse the sword and to follow the way of the cross because they represent two opposing principles of life. The sword produces brutality, the cross brings tenderness; the sword destroys the sanctity of the personality, the cross gives it priceless value; the sword deadens conscience, the cross deepens spiritual perception; the sword causes hatred, the cross compels love; the sword means the attempt to kill your foe, the cross your willingness to die in seeking to save your enemy. "The sacrifice of innocence for guilt is the profoundest truth which God has ever exemplified in a human life."

It is to be doubted if there is to be found a Christian man who has had actual experience with the realities of war who will deny that war is in itself thoroughly unchristian. As an editorial in *The Christian Century* expresses it: "Than war nothing more antithetical to Christianity can be imagined. It is a denial in the baldest possible form of the very life principle of the religion of Jesus. It is anti-Christian in the rawest, nakedest form."

Our major conclusion, then is: *War is inherently unchristian and necessarily involves the violation of or the going contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ.*

V: THE SUPREMACY AND PRACTICABILITY OF THE WAY OF THE CROSS

I

Jesus faced a war situation and refused to take up arms in seeking to free his country from Roman bondage. His teaching is unmistakably opposed to the practices that are inevitably involved in war.

In the light of these facts, what should be the attitude of the present day Christian toward war?

That Jesus claims absolute supremacy cannot be denied. "Follow me" is his summons. *He calls men to his way of life, to live for the same ends for which he lives, to be dominated by the same principles which control him.* "If anyone wishes to come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross, and follow me." "He who loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; he who will not take his cross and follow after me is not worthy of me." Nothing whatever must be allowed to come between Jesus and his disciples, not even loved ones or nation.

In the cross we see the culmination of the great principle of vicarious sacrifice which enters so deeply into human life. It is the climax of a particular way of and outlook upon life, and is *the supreme illustration of a principle that applies to all.* "If we are to get our fellows to believe in the redemptive virtue of Christ's cross," says Professor George Adam Smith, "it will be by proving to them that vicarious suffering and its ethical value are no arbitrary enactments of God, but natural to life and inevitable wherever sin and holiness, guilt and love, encounter and contend." In the principle of the cross is to be found the supreme ideal of all life.

II

It is often said that Jesus would not go to war because of his mission and purpose in life—as the founder of a purely spiritual

Kingdom he could use only spiritual weapons. But while he devoted himself exclusively to the founding of a spiritual kingdom, he sent forth his disciples to win other followers and to change the earthly conditions and environment so that it would be possible for the Father's will to be done "on earth as it is in heaven." To the statement that we cannot conceive of Jesus as a soldier, it is replied, neither can we conceive of Him as a street scavenger, a judge or a President. Jesus had a particular work to do and he devoted himself exclusively to that work.

When Jesus called men to follow him, he did not mean that they were to become carpenters because he was a carpenter, to wear sandals and robes because he wore sandals and a robe, or to copy him externally. He desires his disciples to follow exactly the same principles which he follows, to have absolutely the same attitude, disposition and purpose which he has, and to live for the same end for which he lives. The true Christian must be guided by the same ideals and principles which guide Jesus.

If a thing is *wrong in principle* for Jesus, it is wrong for a Christian. If there is something about the occupation of a street scavenger that is contrary to the principles of Jesus, then a Christian should not follow that occupation. If there is something about the office of a judge, a governor, or a President, that necessitates the violation of the spirit of Jesus, then a Christian should not hold such an office. If being a soldier and participating in war involves the violation of the teaching and spirit of Jesus, a Christian should not be a soldier. Personally, I am unable to discover anything in the profession of a street scavenger that is contrary to the principles of Jesus, whereas the fundamental contention of this discussion is that participation in war involves a direct violation of the teaching and spirit of Jesus.

III

Recently two eminent Christian men were discussing the ethics of war. Both of these men justified and sanctioned a righteous war of self defense, but they based their convictions on different grounds. One man said, "Frankly, I cannot under any conceivable circumstances imagine Jesus using a machine gun to shoot down his enemies." The other man, who was engaged in war work and who was wholeheartedly backing the efforts of the Allies, said: "Now if that is true, I don't care anything about your argument. What is the use of trying to persuade a man to do what Christ wouldn't be willing to do? If Christ wouldn't use a rifle, bayonet

or machine gun under existing conditions if he were in America today, then obviously if I am a Christian I must follow him. I wouldn't go into this war work *till I could see Jesus sighting down a gun barrel and running a bayonet through a man.* It was very clear to me at the start that it is one thing or the other. You can't take a half-way position and evade the issue."

It is my own conviction that both of these statements are true. I cannot possibly conceive of Jesus doing the things which are inevitably involved in war. Nor can I conceive of him asking or desiring that his followers do those things which he himself could not do. If his example, teaching and claims are supreme, then his followers should not adopt and follow a method which is so obviously unchristian.

To say that the way of the cross must be supreme in our lives does not mean that we shall cease to be patriotic or be released from service to the nation. We need a new definition of patriotism and a new scale of values by means of which a man's loyalty and service to his country may be gauged. "Patriotism," says Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, "is love of one's country—a desire to make one's country true and strong—a loyalty to its ideals and institutions—a fidelity to the principles which exalt a nation—a strenuous determination so to live and act as to maintain one's country's ideals and hand them down unimpaired to future generations. This love of country will sometimes lead a citizen to resist the authority of Caesar. No government is given authority by God to force men to do what they believe is wrong. The apostles at the very start had to face the question whether they were to hearken to the civil rulers rather than to God. They settled it then and there and they settled it right."

We must recognize that it is only by giving supreme allegiance to the way of the cross that we become the most loyal citizens of the state. If, as Mazzini says, "no impure man can be a true patriot," it is equally true that no man with wrong ideals and wrong methods can be a true patriot. Who was the truest patriot, Jesus or the Zealot? Who had the welfare of his country most at heart, Jesus or the fanatic with dreams of Israel as a world-empire? Who made the greatest contribution to the welfare of the nation, Jesus or the most victorious captain? Every true patriot must have as his goal: "Above all nations is humanity."

The Christian citizen is under obligation to serve the state, but his *supreme* obligation is to serve the Kingdom of God, and the call is for men to follow the way of Jesus with utter abandon—men who will enter with him into the great adventure of life, risking all on the redeeming power of the way of the cross.

IV

Is the teaching of Jesus practicable for today? In the face of a war situation, invasion and threatened oppression, is it possible for a Christian to remain true to the spirit and principles of Jesus?

Dr. Robert E. Speer, in his recent book, "The Christian Man, the Church and the War," deals with this point in these words: "Can war ever be right, or is war, in moral principle, always wrong? That question will be alive until at last a day comes when the whole world will answer against war. When that day comes, men will look back upon what we say about war now as we look back upon what men used to say about slavery. This book that I am writing, if a copy should remain until that future day of peace, will seem a sad and pitiful thing to any one of its happy citizens who may chance upon it." A few pages further on he makes this statement: "Yes, war is contrary to the teaching and spirit of Jesus."

In his book, "The Challenge of the Present Crisis," Professor Harry Emerson Fosdick uses these emphatic words: "From the standpoint of every high ideal, war is unchristian—essentially, hideously unchristian."

And yet these eminent Christian leaders united in defending the participation of the United States in the Great War, and both books were written to urge Christians to take up arms against Prussian militarism and to aid in winning the war. In one breath they say, War is hideously unchristian and contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus; in the next they say, Go to war, take up the sword and destroy German militarism. They confess that in the world as it now is it is not possible always to follow the teaching of Jesus or always to live in accordance with his spirit. Professor Forsyth expresses this conviction in so many words: "To offer the esoteric Christian ethic for public use when national passion is rising or loose is to stroke a crocodile or tickle a tiger. The right and fit thing to do then is to fall back on an inferior ethic and make the best of it."

V

But is this the attitude of Jesus himself? Did he intend that his teaching should be fully applied only when the Kingdom had fully come to pass, or did he intend it to be the means of bringing in the Kingdom? "If it is not true," says W. Dunlop Robinson, "that the teaching of Jesus is the only road to a successful and satis-

factory life in this present world and under present conditions, it is difficult to understand why one should attempt to follow it at all." And Professor Scott says: "It would be easy to review the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount, one by one, and show that they would be meaningless in a perfect world."

"When he called upon men to follow him, to share his baptism and drink his cup," says W. E. Orchard, "*he was not mocking them with impossible ideals.* He was asking them to be as he was, to live for the same ends, to undertake the same task. Jesus invited men to his ethical and spiritual level. The blunting of this call by the declaration that Jesus can never be followed by mortal men is responsible for the low state of Christian discipleship."

Another Christian man bases his defense of war upon the statement that there are times when "Christianity does not function rapidly enough." But if visible temporary results are the basis of our judgment, surely we must confess that Jesus' own life was a failure. As he was hanging there on the cross, what were the visible successes of his efforts? What had he done to overthrow Roman militarism? What had he done to abolish human slavery? What had he done to protect the weak and helpless from the exploitation of the powerful? What had he done to remove the grievous burdens imposed upon his countrymen by the foreign conqueror and despot? Judging by outward appearances, surely his contemporaries could turn from his principles because they did not "function rapidly enough." No wonder men preferred the blood and thunder method of the Zealots—they were men of action, they were *doing something!*

VI

"We look

But at the surface of things; we hear
Of towns in flames, fields ravaged, young and old
Driven out in troops to want and nakedness;
Then grasp our swords and rush upon a cure
That flatters us, because it asks not thought:
The deeper malady is better hid,
The world is poisoned at the heart."

It is when we examine more closely the ultimate effects of Jesus' life that we recognize more clearly the wide gulf between temporary and permanent results. And it is when we examine his method that we see the futility of attempting to overthrow evil by adopting the weapons of Satan. "In measuring utility," says John Morley, "you have to take into account not merely the service rendered

to the objects of the present hour, but the contribution of growth, progress and the future. A principle, if it be sound, represents one of the larger expediencies. To abandon that for the sake of some seeming expediency of the hour, is to sacrifice the greater good for the less, on no more creditable ground than that the less is nearer."

"It is true," says J. C. Murray, "that spiritual weapons will not always secure what is commonly understood by success; that is, success in external life. But no man is under obligation to be successful in this sense. Such success depends not only on the voluntary efforts of individuals, but on the operation also of vast and complicated forces which are beyond individual control. The utmost therefore that can be required of any man is to will what is right and leave the issue to the Ruler of the Universe, by whom all its agencies are controlled. It requires no unusual keenness of spiritual insight to discern that a success, won by violating the eternal principles on which the universe is governed, is a defeat in the most tragic sense of the term. It is all the more tragic because of the illusion of victory by which its real character is concealed. On that Good Friday in the history of our race, the cause which was more closely identified with the cause of righteousness for the world than any other can ever be, seemed to go down in disaster more irretrievable than any cause has ever sustained. And yet it is a sober historical fact that that defeat was the most triumphant victory in the moral welfare of the world."

Undoubtedly the Christian is confronted with situations from which there is no escape save at the cost of great suffering and perhaps the loss of life. In this respect he is only following in the steps of the Master. Jesus frankly warned his disciples of the dangers that would come because of their following his teaching and example. He knew that they would suffer persecution and death because of their allegiance to him and his spirit of love. He told them that the day would come when men would imagine they were serving God by killing them.

VII

If in 1914 the Christian people of the various nations had refused to compromise by taking up the sword, if they had shown the same spirit of loyalty, sacrifice and utter disregard of consequences which was displayed by the soldiers in the recent conflict, if they had staked everything upon the redeeming power of sacrificial and unconquerable love, if they had followed the way of the

cross, it would have meant the death of many—but it would have proved to be the most powerful factor in the healing of the nations and in hastening the coming of the Kingdom of God.

“The ages when the church has made vast conquests,” says George D. Herron, “have been the ages of persecution, when the church was bearing away the sin of the world in its body and shedding its blood for the world’s cleaning; when devotion to Christ was the passion of life; when the disciples rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer with the blows aimed at their Lord, and gave their bodies to be the dust of the highway over which the redeemed should walk into his kingdom.”

In the face of the actual historical fact that the greatest progress of the human race has come by the way of the cross, shall we still maintain that it is not practicable to solve the problems of our day? Rather, let us say with E. A. Burroughs: “The nature of the universe being what it is, the thorough-going idealist is also the most thoroughly practical man. We have scorned idealism, and we have failed to be practical.”

The example and teaching of Jesus are supreme for the Christian. His principle of redeeming love is the great ideal of all ages. The way of the cross is the most practicable way of serving mankind and of advancing the Kingdom of God.

VI: THE ONLY SURE WAY TO ABOLISH WAR

I

Has the Great War ended war? We would like to believe that it has. We are not so sure of it as we were during those hours of delirious joy on Armistice Day. We are afraid that it has not. The international situation does not permit any easy optimism.

The one bright ray of light seems to be the League of Nations. In it we place our hope. Without it we are sure to be plunged into another war. And yet many voices tell us that the League itself is a source of danger. We are reminded of the words of Colonel Roosevelt: "Let us never forget that any promise that such a league of nations or any other piece of machinery will definitely do away with war, is either sheer nonsense or rank hypocrisy."

Our own judgment tells us that the League cannot prevent war unless the nations enter it in the right spirit. And yet it is just this matter of *the spirit of the nations* that troubles us the most. Everywhere there are unmistakable evidences of a rising tide of jealousy, rivalry, suspicion, fear, hatred and enmity. If this tide continues to advance it will overwhelm us with another war. Until it recedes no League can ultimately prevent war.

In the face of such an international situation, what can the militant Christian do to prevent war?.

For the follower of Jesus, the test of the morality of any procedure is, *Is it Christian?* Is it in harmony with the spirit and teaching of Jesus? The test is not, Is it the lesser of two wrongs? Is it sanctioned or commanded by the state or church? Is it in accordance with international law or the accepted code of morals of the majority? Is it sanctioned in the Old Testament? The supreme test is, Is it Christian?

In the effort to overcome dangerous heresies, is it right to torture men until they die in agony? In seeking to protect one's family from malignant evil spirits, is it right to burn witches at the stake? In endeavoring to overthrow corrupt politicians and in the interest

of an honest and patriotic candidate, is it right to outbid your corrupt opponent and purchase enough votes to win the election? In attempting to defend your country from the onslaught of a murderous autocratic militarism, is it right to make use of unchristian weapons?

For a disciple of Jesus, in each case the decision hinges upon the answer to the question, Is it Christian? Is it a thing that Jesus could do without sin? Is it in harmony with his teaching and desires? Can it be followed without violating his way of life? Is it such that he can use it, sanction it and bless it? If the devout monk had decided the question solely upon these grounds, he should not have used torture to conquer the heretic, the judges should not have used the stake to silence witches, the politician should not adopt the evil practices of his opponent, and if the Christian citizen uses this same test, he should not, in my opinion, use the sword in resisting the military despot.

Not even in seeking to protect his family is the follower of Jesus justified in doing a thing that is unchristian. As great and solemn as is the obligation to defend one's family, it is not the supreme duty of the Christian. All will admit that there are times when a man has a higher loyalty than to his family. A concrete case may help to make this clear. When in wartime a man who possesses information essential to the enemy has been taken prisoner with his family, and is faced with the alternative of yielding to his captors, divulging the desired information and betraying his country, or having his wife killed before his own eyes, loyalty to country takes precedence over loyalty to family. No man is ever justified in betraying his country even to save his family.

II

If this is true with regard to the citizen and the state, how much the more is it true with regard to the Christian and the Kingdom of God. Again and again the followers of Jesus have had to decide which was the higher loyalty, to him and his principles, or to family. The early Christians faced these alternatives, and gladly offered themselves and their loved ones as living sacrifices in the arena with the lion and the tiger, rather than forsake his way of life. The reformers faced these alternatives and together with their families were burned at the stake, rather than recant and deny the Christian truth. Christians in the heart of Africa have given Christ supreme loyalty and have seen their loved ones carried into a slavery worse than death, rather than betray him

and adopt the Moslem religion. The proud Brahmin in India faces these alternatives and gives up father and mother, wife and daughter, for the sake of Jesus Christ. The Christian in every age has had to decide to whom supreme loyalty should be rendered to self, to family, to tribe, to nation, or to the Kingdom of God.

It is infinitely more important that a man should be true to Jesus and His principles than to protect his family at the expense of the Kingdom. A Christian is never justified in following a course of action that is utterly opposed to the principles of the Kingdom, not even to serve the temporal well-being of family or nation.

And the case against war is made doubly strong when we examine the evidence as to how it actually defends women and children. Take the recent war, for example. Has the sword protected the women and children of any belligerent nation? Call the roll. Belgium! Brave little Belgium! Has the sacrificial death of her sons sufficed to protect her women and children? Alas, it has not, and history records few instances of greater suffering by the helpless of any land. Indeed, we have heard a hundred times more of the outraging of women and the killing of little children in Belgium than in Luxemburg, where the husbands and fathers offered no armed resistance.

Perhaps no higher authority could be quoted in this connection than Brand Whitlock, the American Minister to Belgium. Listen to what he says: "In all those regions where the Germans could pass without resistance from the Belgian or French or English troops, there were no massacres and no incendiarism in the grand style. There were many isolated cases of individual outrages and atrocity, of course, but no systematic organized annihilation of cities, no massacre of peoples as at Louvain, Dinant, Aerschot, Tamines, Vise."

Has war protected the women and children of Serbia, of Roumania, of Poland, of Armenia? Millions in these lands have suffered and died in agony as the direct result of this war. Has war protected the women of France, Italy, Russia, Germany, England? Travel through these lands and see the results of the war and be convinced of the fact that it has done anything else other than protect them. Think of the increased immorality and crime caused by the war, of the tens of thousands of men who have returned from the war to blast their wives and children with foul diseases. Think of the awful suspense of these four years of anxious waiting, the agony of soul at the news of the loss of the loved one, the vacant chairs at the fireside, the crippled heroes who will limp through life, a heavy burden upon their wives and children, think of the shattered dreams, blasted hopes and broken

heart, caused by the war. War protects women and children! It is tragic mockery, war is the arch-enemy of womanhood and childhood!

The use of the sword as a weapon of defense has resulted in the death of ten millions of soldiers and non-combatants, and in the mutilation of millions more. Can any sane man believe that Germany would have deliberately slaughtered in cold blood ten millions of people had she been met with the spirit of the cross rather than with the sword? We must admit that as a means of defending women and children, war is a ghastly failure.

III

The use of the sword may preserve political freedom and liberty of thought and action. And it is here, in the final analysis, that the ethics of war must be determined. *Is war justifiable as a means of preserving political liberty?*

Jesus had little to say about political freedom, he had much to say about moral and spiritual freedom. When confronted with the question of human freedom, he saw that unless men's hearts were changed, freedom from Rome would simply mean an exchange of masters. To destroy the oppressors of a nation is not Jesus' way of bringing freedom to its citizens. Real freedom is not a racial, national or international problem; it is personal. Caesar, exercising authority over tens of thousands and dining in royal style, is shackled by many passions; Paul, loaded with chains and eating his prison fare, knows no master, save One. Pilate with his diadem of gold and glass of wine, is slave; Jesus, with his crown of thorns and cup of gall, is free. "If the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed."

Not even when the political freedom of a nation is at stake should the Christian militant make use of an unchristian weapon. *The following of Jesus Christ is infinitely more important than the maintenance of political liberty at the expense of his principles.*

IV

It is not enough to hold a negative attitude and to say that the Christian militant should never sanction any practice which is opposed to the spirit and teaching of Jesus. He must also be prepared to deal in a positive way with the actual situations in every day life. "One great obstacle to world-peace," says President Faunce, "is the passive and flabby conception of peace which dream-

ers and sentimentalists have set before us. Rejecting the philosophy of blood and iron, they have sometimes offered us a philosophy of milk and water. They have urged upon us a vast and permanent negative."

In the face of danger and threatened oppression, what should the follower of Jesus do? *Be Christian!* And what does it mean to be Christian? To be guided solely by the principles of Jesus and to live for exactly the same ends for which he lived. "*When a man chooses Christ he has to do on the absolute basis that Christ is what he means by truth,*" says W. E. Orchard, "*and that Christ's career is what he calls success.*"

The Christian in Belgium or in England in 1914 should not have gone to war, in my opinion, since war is violently unchristian. He should have been Christian, that is, he should have lived in the spirit of Jesus Christ, returning good for evil, love for hatred, mercy for cruelty, kindness for atrocity. Even if his country had been conquered by Germany, he would have confronted the same situation which Jesus faced, and like Jesus he should have sought to get rid of the oppressor by other means than the sword.

As to how this spirit of love and good-will should be manifested must depend upon the circumstances of each individual case. One thing at least is clear, it seems to me: no Christian should ever retaliate with war for war, no Christian should choose the sword and reject the cross. Starting with the avowed determination always to refuse any practice which is contrary to the spirit of Jesus, each Christian must determine the channel through which he can best show love for friends and enemy alike.

The way of the cross is not primarily a program of action or a mechanism, it is an attitude, a spirit, a relationship. Jesus left no detailed code of laws and he outlined no definite program of overcoming the evils of his day. He was concerned with fundamental principles and laid emphasis upon frame of mind, attitude, relationship. He left it to each Christian to decide his own actions under given circumstances.

Christianity is not a code of laws, yet it furnishes a standard of measurement by means of which every detailed choice of life may be gauged. In the first century and in the twentieth, the individual Christian must determine his own course of action in the light of the spirit and teaching of Jesus. He gave Peter, James and John no definite program or mechanism by which they could overcome slavery, idolatry, licentiousness and militarism, and he gives the Christian of today no scheme of overcoming militarism and oppression. It is by lives lived in the spirit of human brotherhood and worship toward God that he seeks to overcome slavery

and idolatry, and it is by lives of aggressive good-will and love at all times and under all circumstances that he seeks to overcome militarism and oppression.

V

In this discussion, I am confining myself to a consideration of whether or not the Christian should ever sanction or participate in war. I am not making any attempt to deal with the *mechanism* of overcoming oppression and preventing war, exceedingly important as is a definite program of action. I am seeking simply to discover the *corner stone* upon which this program may be built.

Inability to foretell the consequences of our refusal to take up the sword in time of threatened oppression should not deter us from following the way of the cross. The spirit of the reply of Wendell Phillips holds true in this connection: "I will not discuss with you the specific details of what would happen if the slaves were freed," he said. "I entrench myself in the principle of human liberty and leave the results to Almighty God." No human being could have foretold the results that have come from the Good Friday cross. No one can ever foretell the results that will come when an individual resolutely follows the way of the cross. The utmost that we can do is to sow the seed, God must give the harvest.

That necessity is the mother of invention has been demonstrated repeatedly in the recent war. And it will be so in discovering a Christian substitute for war. When Christian people come to the absolute conviction that *all* war is unchristian and should *never* be participated in, when they withdraw their sanction from war, when they cease to depend upon it for protection, when they set themselves resolutely to finding means of applying Christian principles in industrial, national and international life, we may hope to see the abolition of war and the dawning of a new day of good-will and human brotherhood.

The Christian militant of the present day is faced with a tremendous challenge. He is challenged to a deeper faith in Jesus' way of life, to an undying conviction that the way of the cross is the most dynamic, powerful and compelling manner of life. Mightier than divisions of infantry and cavalry, more powerful than dynamite and ammonal, more irresistible than poison gas and boiling oil, is the spirit of the cross. It is the one thing in the world that cannot be frightened, discouraged or conquered. It is the one sure way of overcoming personal, industrial and political oppression. Truly it is the greatest thing in the world.

This faith should be so deep and abiding that the Christian militant would refuse to admit that Prussianism, Mohammedanism or any other militarism can conquer *pure* Christianity, and would refuse to allow any militarist so to intimidate him as to cause him to lose confidence in the way of the cross.

The Christian militant is challenged to a more strenuous search for ways of applying the spirit of the cross in industrial, national and international affairs, as well as in personal affairs.

He is challenged to a more intense loyalty to Jesus' way of life, to an eager willingness to follow this way in spite of all obstacles, dangers and consequences. He is challenged to adopt Jesus' standard of success and failure and his estimate of time. As was the case with him, the Christian militant should lose sight of temporary suffering and persecution in seeking to advance the ultimate well-being of mankind. He should recognize that it was this long distance view of time that compelled Jesus to refuse the sword and to make no military effort to bring about the immediate political freedom of his people, and that it was this same vision that caused him to choose the way of the cross and to go down in defeat, as the world measures success. And if the Christian militant is to be true to the Master, he must also choose the way of the cross and must follow Jesus *even though the path lead to seeming defeat.*

VI

The Christian militant is challenged to follow his convictions and to refuse all compromise with means and weapons that are unchristian. If he believes firmly that war is always an unchristian way of seeking to achieve a righteous end, he should be loyal to that conviction in the face of any pressure or danger, and be no less courageous than the soldier in battle. He should be loyal to his conviction even in the face of aroused public opinion and popular clamor. He should refuse to be swayed by frenzied passion or surface patriotism, but should remember that the truest patriotism is shown only by loyalty to one's highest moral convictions.

The call is for men and women who will follow the way of the cross with the same courage and abandon with which the soldier serves his country, who are willing to risk everything for the Kingdom of God, who have learned to count all things loss for Christ's sake, and who will follow his way of life without qualification or compromise.

To increase the number of men and women in all lands who will refuse absolutely to sanction the use of any unchristian weapon, who will follow without compromise the teaching and example of Jesus Christ, and who will seek diligently by every possible means to spread abroad in the lives of individuals and of nations the spirit of Jesus, this is the only sure way to abolish war.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

After nineteen hundred years of Christian profession, all Christendom today stands reproached by the tragic evidences of its failure to establish Christian practice. The war has not simply proclaimed the violation of Christian principles between nations. It has laid bare the heart of twentieth century civilization and has disclosed widespread disregard of Christian standards in sordid commercialism, industrial strife and social injustice. In the events of the present time there are compelling reasons why the Christian conscience should be quickened to penitence and roused to discover what deep-seated misconception of the personality and principles of Christ or what fatal facility for compromise has been responsible for the failure to make His will effective in the social order.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation unites a group of Christian seekers for a better way of life. It is founded in the faith that love as revealed in the life, teachings and death of Jesus Christ is not only the fundamental basis of a true human society, but the effective power for overcoming evil, and that loyalty to humanity and to Christ calls His followers to new endeavors to practice love unswervingly at whatever cost, and to make it supreme in personal, social, industrial, national and international life.

Information as to the principles, literature and methods of the Fellowship will be given gladly on request. Inquiries should be addressed to the Fellowship of Reconciliation, 108 Lexington Ave., New York City.

APPROVED BY THE LEADERS

The Nation, New York:

In his searching little volume, "The Sword or the Cross," Mr. Kirby Page presents with force and truth the extreme position against war which must in our opinion be taken by everybody who would be a sincere and loyal follower of the teachings of Jesus. Undoubtedly this book would not have been allowed to circulate during the war, which is but another proof of the fact that all wars constitute in themselves a denial of Jesus and everything that he stood for. We wish for Mr. Page's little volume what is, alas, an impossible wish, that it be placed in the hands of every school child in this allegedly Christian nation. It would do a world of good and be a powerful weapon in the fight which is now on to save humanity from being exterminated by the very science of warfare which it has lately devised, it being today a problem whether war shall go or civilization perish.

The World Tomorrow, New York:

This book is a valuable contribution to the discussion of the Christian attitude to war, coming as it does from the experience of one who went overseas with a quite different conception. Mr. Page portrays the terrible reality of war, shows how the church now defending war has often taken the wrong side on great moral questions, and makes it clear that Jesus faced a similar situation to that of 1914. In his analysis of Jesus' teachings on the subject the author avoids the doubtful proof-test method and also steers clear of side issues as to possible uses of force, and shows how the whole spirit of that teaching is a repudiation of the way of the sword, and an enthronement of its opposite, the way of the cross.

The Presbyterian Advance, Nashville:

In six clear, strong, concise chapters the author presents a terrible condemnation of war and a strong argument for its complete

abandonment by those who would act fully in accordance with the mind and spirit of Jesus. In fact, we are dared to act upon the very obvious teachings of the Master and to risk all in the determination to be true idealists, as he was. With the war spirit still upon us and our familiarity with the excuses which are given for war, the author will be deemed a most pronounced pacifist, and so he is, because he understands that nothing less is demanded of the follower of Christ. Even many who are fully satisfied that war is sometimes justifiable would do well to read this straightforward little book and get the other point of view, for it reveals a kind of heroism in the pacifist which is sometimes mistaken for cowardice.

The Christian Herald, New York:

What might have been the history of the last twenty centuries if the church had consistently opposed war? The writer of this book reminds us again of the teachings of Jesus, many of them still but dimly comprehended or even wholly misunderstood. The "sword," of which he spoke in Matt. 10:34 and Luke 22:36, was to mark the line of division between right and wrong, to make a cleavage, not in the bodies of men, but in the ancient philosophies and age-old customs, and especially in the interpretation of religion. His teachings to his followers, his rejection of the tempter's lure of worldly greatness and power, his new standard of love and kindness, of forgiveness, of brotherhood, were all against war and bloodshed. His kingdom was not one of power and possessions and mighty armies and wars. It is, as clearly as his words could express it, a kingdom in the hearts of men who place love and faith and kindness and mercy above all the prizes of the world, with its fightings and conquests. This was the meaning accepted in the early church. Has the modern church wholly forgotten the glorious vision? This book is timely and inspirational.

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK, New York:

Let me congratulate you upon a very sincere and impressive piece of work. As you know, I do not completely agree with all your conclusions, but your presentation of your point of view seems to me the best statement which I have yet read of it. Even though my method of attack on war may not be identical with yours, I am so sure that the presence of war is the greatest outstanding challenge to Christianity, that I sincerely trust that your book may have a wide circulation and an earnest reading.

REV. CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, Broadway Tabernacle, New York:

I like the style of your presentation, and also the noble Christian spirit that breathes through what you have written. You know that I am not able to go quite so far as you do, but I am always happy to have men who feel as you do express their convictions, for it is possible that you are right, and that the rest of us will have to come up where you are.

GALE SEAMAN, International Y. M. C. A. Secretary:

I wish every High School and College student in the United States could read "The Sword or the Cross."

BISHOP FRANCIS J. McCONNELL, Pittsburgh:

The book is nobly conceived and finely written and is in itself a high spiritual achievement.

PROF. HARRY F. WARD, Union Theological Seminary:

Mr. Page has faced the issue and has found an answer that satisfies his soul. What he has written, therefore, deserves the thoughtful consideration of all those whose duty it is to teach the people concerning the moral and spiritual validity of war.

PROFESSOR RUFUS M. JONES, Haverford College:

I have read your book, "The Sword or the Cross," with deep appreciation. I feel sure it should have a very helpful mission, and I hope it will have a large circulation. It is very convincing and is written in just the right style to accomplish its purpose. I have no criticism whatever to make of it.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, New York:

The book is well done and deserves a wide reading.

NORMAN THOMAS, Associate Editor, *The Nation*:

My immediate reaction is one of unqualified approval.

F. ERNEST JOHNSON, of the Federal Council of Churches:

Here is a concise putting of Christianity's case against war. The author has done a valuable piece of work.

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY, PUBLISHERS
244 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK

No. 1—INDUSTRIAL FACTS, BY KIRBY PAGE.

Concrete data concerning such industrial problems as concentration of wealth and control, poverty, low wages, unemployment, long hours. Brief descriptions of proposed solutions and statements of Christian principles that have a bearing upon these problems.

32 Pages—10 Cents Net

No. 2—COLLECTIVE BARGAINING, BY KIRBY PAGE.

An ethical evaluation of some phases of trade unionism and the open shop movement.

32 Pages—10 Cents Net

No. 3—FELLOWSHIP, BY BASIL MATHEWS AND HARRY BISSEKER.

Preface by Sherwood Eddy.

A consideration of fellowship as a means of building the Christian social order. This pamphlet emphasizes the importance of group discussion in seeking light upon industrial problems and the need for closer coöperation between those of like purpose.

32 Pages—10 Cents Net

No. 4—THE SWORD OR THE CROSS, BY KIRBY PAGE.

A consideration of the ethics of war between nations and between classes; an analysis of Jesus' way of life.

64 Pages—15 Cents Net
(Regular Edition, \$1.20)

Persons desiring quantities of these pamphlets for use in classes, discussion groups or open forums, or for distribution among their friends, may secure copies of Nos. 1, 2 and 3 at the rate of 70 cents for ten copies, or \$6.00 per hundred, postpaid, and copies of No. 4 in lots of five at 10 cents each, from Kirby Page, 311 Division Avenue, Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey.

THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION

AN ANALYSIS OF THE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES
OF MODERN BUSINESS POLICIES

BY

KIRBY PAGE

AUTHOR OF "THE SWORD OR THE CROSS,"
"INDUSTRIAL FACTS," "COLLECTIVE BARGAINING," ETC.

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION FROM
THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY

MAY, 1922



NEW YORK

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

Ten Cents Net.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
"A CORPORATION WITH A SOUL"	10
HOURS OF WORK	11
WAGES	13
FAMILY BUDGETS	14
COST OF ABOLISHING THE TWELVE-HOUR DAY	16
EARNINGS OF THE STEEL CORPORATION	17
OVERCAPITALIZATION	19
SUMMARY OF EARNINGS	20
CAUSES OF LOW WAGES AND LONG HOURS	21
LABOR POLICY	22
POWER OF THE CORPORATION	23
CONSEQUENCES OF ANTI-UNION POLICY	25
CONCLUDING QUESTIONS	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY	27

**THE UNITED STATES STEEL
CORPORATION**

THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION

WHAT are the social consequences of current business policies? To what extent are human values subordinated in the effort to secure large returns on invested capital? Do the workers receive an adequate share of the proceeds of modern industry? How shall we determine an equitable adjustment of profits and wages? Wherein resides the dominant power in the control of modern business?

This study of one of our large corporations is an attempt to shed light upon such questions as these. The United States Steel Corporation was selected for this purpose because of its magnitude and the important part which it plays in one of our basic industries. A preliminary draft of this manuscript was sent to Judge Elbert H. Gary, Chairman of the Corporation, with the request that he point out any statements that he regarded as inaccurate or unfair. He very kindly arranged that I might have an interview with three of the Corporation officials, and later that I might have a personal interview with him. He most generously set aside an hour and a half for an informal discussion of the subject matter of this article. For this interview he also invited in Mr. James A. Farrell, President of the Steel Corporation; Mr. William J. Filbert, Comptroller; Mr. C. L. Close, head of the Bureau of Safety, Sanitation, and Welfare; and Mr. George K. Leet, his secretary.

There are many statements herein with which these

gentlemen do not agree, some of which they regard as inaccurate or misleading. I have endeavored to note the most important of these in footnotes. The officials of the Corporation emphatically disagree with the general viewpoint of this article. Perhaps I ought to state that I do not regard the policies of the Steel Corporation as unique, but rather as a fair illustration of practices which are widely prevalent in modern business circles. It seems highly important that a vigorous effort be made to discover the social consequences and ethical implications of these policies.

"A CORPORATION WITH A SOUL"

This is the subtitle of a recent book dealing with the United States Steel Corporation. There is much to be said in favor of the contention that this Corporation has a soul. Ninety-five millions of dollars have been spent by the Steel Corporation in various kinds of welfare work for its employees.

It is estimated that safety-devices installed and precautionary measures taken have reduced the number of accidents in its plants approximately 55 per cent.

Much attention has been given to the protection of the health of its workers. Twenty-five base hospitals have been erected and supported.

Large sums have been expended for sanitation, toilet and locker facilities, lunch-rooms, club-rooms, playgrounds, athletic fields, and other recreational features.

Fifty schools and twenty-six churches have been built. Many thousands of dollars have been appropriated for the building of houses for its employees.

Employees have been given the opportunity to purchase stock in the Corporation, and thousands of them are now small stockholders.

The Corporation has been tremendously successful in its business. Its products have found their way into all parts of the world. Regular dividends have been paid and a huge reserve has been built up. Enormous sums have been paid to the Federal Government in taxes. High wages are paid to its skilled mechanics. The average earnings of all employees during the year 1920 were approximately seven dollars per day.

HOURS OF WORK

There are other factors, however, which need to be taken into account. First of all, let us inquire as to hours and working conditions. In his testimony before the United States Senate investigating committee, Judge Gary, Chairman of the Steel Corporation, said: "Twenty-six and a half per cent of all employees work the twelve-hour turn, and the number is 69,284."

Concerning the proportion of those actually employed in the processes of steel-making who work the twelve-hour day, Mr. Horace B. Drury,¹ after an extensive investigation, says:—

So far as concerns these continuous operation processes which make up the heart of the steel industry, such as the blast furnace, the open-hearth furnace, and most types of rolling mills, together with the various auxiliary departments necessary to keep these processes going and make a complete plant, the bulk of the employees work 12 hours. All the men whose presence is essential to the carrying-on of the processes, from the chemist and boss down to the lowest helper,—the technical graduate, the American-born roller, and the unskilled foreigner,—all these, with very few exceptions, work 12 hours. Most likely the percentage of 12-hour workers for the whole plant—

¹ Recently with the Industrial Relations Division of the United States Shipping Board; formerly of the Economics Department, Ohio State University.

which, we are assuming, is entirely, or almost entirely, devoted to the more fundamental steel processes—will be considerably over 50 per cent; in some cases two thirds. . . . For them and for their families, numbering perhaps a half or three quarters of a million of people, the 12-hour day has become a fixed industrial habit, firmly intrenched in the traditions of the industry and in human lives and habits.¹

As to the necessity for the twelve-hour shift, Mr. Drury reminds us that in England, France, Germany, Sweden, Italy, Belgium, and Spain it has been abandoned, and that twenty steel plants in America are now running on three shifts.

As to the increased cost of steel under an eight-hour day, Mr. Drury says: "If all the departments in a steel plant were to be changed from two to three shifts, the increase in total cost for the finished rail, bar, or plate could not, on the average, be more than about 3 per cent."²

As to the effects of the twelve-hour day, President Farrell said that the situation is not so bad as it is often pictured. He said that many of the men actually work only half of the time they are on duty. The other side of the case is presented by Mr. John A. Fitch in these words:—

Some of the twelve-hour men, such as blooming-mill rollers, for example, are busy practically every minute of the full twelve hours of work. Others work under conditions of such strain, or under such heat, that "spell-hands" are provided. Others, as in the open-hearth furnaces, have periods of idleness between heats. When these men work, however, they work under conditions of terrific strain and in great heat.

¹ *Bulletin of the Taylor Society*, vol. vi, no. 1, Feb. 1921. *The Three-Shift System in the Steel Industry*, by Horace B. Drury, pp. 3, 4. Concerning this report, Mr. C. L. Patterson, Secretary of the Bureau of Labor, National Association of Steel and Tin-Plate Manufacturers, said: "Mr. Drury has given us the most illuminating and thorough analysis of the subject that I have ever heard or read."

² Mr. Wm. J. Filbert, Comptroller of the Corporation, said to the present writer that the increase in labor-costs would greatly exceed 3 per cent.

Judge Gary said that the Corporation is endeavoring to abolish the twelve-hour day and hopes to succeed within the near future.

It does not require a vivid imagination to picture the consequences of the twelve-hour day. Twelve hours at the mill, one half-hour going to and one half-hour coming from work, and one half-hour for breakfast and one half-hour for supper, eight hours sleep—add these up! A scant two hours are left for domestic duties, home life, social and civic life, reading and study! What sort of a husband, father, and citizen is a twelve-hour worker likely to be? How much energy and interest is such a worker likely to have left for intellectual and spiritual matters?

WAGES

Let us next analyze the wages paid by the Steel Corporation. Surely wages must be adequate if the average for all employees in 1920 was approximately seven dollars per day. There is no doubt that skilled labor is paid well, in comparison with other industries. But how about unskilled labor? According to the Interchurch Report on the Steel Strike of 1919—

The annual earnings of over one third of all productive iron and steel workers were, and had been for years, below the level set by government experts as the minimum subsistence standard for families of five. The annual earnings of 72 per cent of all workers were, and had been for years, below the level set by government experts as the minimum of comfort level for families of five. This second standard being the lowest which scientists are willing to term an "American standard of living," it follows that nearly three quarters of the steel workers could not earn enough for an American standard of living.

That was the condition in 1919. What are the facts at the present time?

Three successive wage-cuts during 1921 reduced the wages of unskilled labor in the employ of the Steel Corporation slightly more than 40 per cent, the rate now being 30 cents per hour, with no extra pay for overtime.¹ Eight hours a day, six days per week, at this rate amounts to \$14.40 per week—\$748.80 per year, if no time is lost from sickness or otherwise. Is this a partial explanation of the reluctance of the employees to give up the twelve-hour day, about which we hear so much?

Ten hours a day at this rate amounts to \$18 per week, or \$936 per year. Twelve hours a day at this rate amounts to \$21.60 per week, or \$1123.20 per year.

The number of workers in normal times receiving this lowest wage is about 70,000. About 30 per cent of the steel workers are unmarried. These figures mean that about 50,000 married men are unable to earn as much as \$1150 per year, even by working twelve hours per day and fifty-two weeks per year. The size of the average American family is five—father, mother, and three children under fourteen years of age. The average family of the foreign steel worker has 6.63 members.²

FAMILY BUDGETS

Persons who are interested in human and community welfare will pause to inquire as to the standard of life these thousands of families are able to maintain. Extensive investigations have been made by a number of agencies as to minimum health and decency budgets,

¹ *Literary Digest*, October 1, 1921, p. 58. Judge Gary pointed out to the present writer that some of the independent steel concerns are paying only 25 cents an hour to unskilled workers.

² Steel Corporation officials say that the average family has more than one wage-earner. It is undoubtedly true, however, that there are many thousands of families with small children in which there is only one wage-earner.

among which are those of Professor Ogburn, Professor Chapin, the New York Factory Investigation Commission, the New York Board of Estimate. These estimates were made at different periods, but it is possible to reduce them to a common date. At the average prices prevailing in June, 1918, they varied from \$1317 to \$1395 per year. According to the National Industrial Conference Board, an organization maintained by employers' associations, the cost of living in June, 1918, was 52 per cent higher than in July, 1914. The high peak was reached in July, 1920, when the increase over 1914 amounted to 104 per cent. In July, 1921, the increase over 1914 was 63 per cent, an increase of 7 per cent as compared with July, 1918.

Reduced to the prices of July, 1921, these minimum budgets vary from \$1410 to \$1490, the average being \$1465. In the opinion of these authorities, a family of five cannot maintain a minimum health and decency standard on less than \$1465, at July, 1921, prices. During August and September, 1921, there was a slight upward trend in the cost of living. At the prices of July, 1921, \$1465 was the equivalent of \$898 at July, 1914, prices. Any reader who has had experience with family budgets during this period of high cost of living will recognize that \$1465 is an exceedingly limited annual budget for father, mother, and three children under fourteen.

Fifty thousand married workers in the employ of the United States Steel Corporation in normal times, by working twelve hours per day, six days per week, and fifty-two weeks per year, can earn only \$1125—\$340 less than this minimum health and decency budget. As a matter of fact, the actual earnings of a large proportion of these men are much less than \$1125 per year, because of lost time and unemployment.

Our next inquiry is, of course, whether or not the Steel Corporation could afford to pay its married workers a

living wage. To increase the annual pay of these 50,000 married men \$340 each, would require \$17,000,000. In the scale above these men is a group of 60,000 semi-skilled workers, of whom approximately 40,000 are married men. To increase the annual pay of this group the modest sum of \$200 per year, would require \$8,000,000.

If the annual wages of 50,000 married men in the unskilled class were increased \$340 each, and those of 40,000 married men in the semi-skilled class were increased \$200 each, the additional cost to the Steel Corporation would be \$25,000,000 a year.¹

COST OF ABOLISHING THE TWELVE-HOUR DAY

This would still leave the twelve-hour day undisturbed, however. Can the Steel Corporation afford to pay these wages for an eight-hour day?

To change from two shifts to three shifts per day would not require a 50 per cent increase in the number of employees, because eight-hour workers are more efficient than twelve-hour workers. After investigation, Mr. Drury estimated that the change to three shifts would not require more than a 35 per cent increase in the working force.

With regard to the cost of changing to an eight-hour day, Mr. John A. Fitch says, in the *Survey*:—

If the Steel Corporation had introduced the three-shift system in 1920 by increasing its force in the departments affected by 35 per cent, and had paid each man as much for eight hours as he formerly had received for twelve, the addition to the pay roll would be something over \$61,000,000. This statement is

¹ Judge Gary told the present writer that he regards it as utterly impracticable to pay different rates to single men and married men. He said that wages cannot be determined on a basis of family budgets. He said that rates of wages respond to the laws of supply and demand.

made without taking into account a probable increase in efficiency that would cut down the cost very materially.

As a matter of fact, however, the actual increase would probably be very much less than \$61,000,000. After his investigation of the twenty steel plants in the United States which have already adopted the three-shift system, Mr. Drury says:—

There seems, in fact, to be substantial reason for believing—in view of results already accomplished in some of the plants—that, when the three-shift system once gets into fair running order, the labor-cost need not be to any great degree higher than it has been under two-shift operation; and, indeed, a rather fair argument might be drawn up to show that all of the increase in labor-costs might in time be wiped out.¹

EARNINGS OF THE STEEL CORPORATION

Now let us look into the question of the financial ability of the Corporation to stand higher wage-costs. The annual report for 1920 shows that the total earnings were slightly more than \$185,000,000, and the net income \$130,000,000.

The first annual report of the Corporation was for the year ending December 31, 1902. In the eighteen years following, ending December 31, 1920, the total earnings of all properties, after deducting all expenditures incident to operation, including ordinary repairs and maintenance, also interest on bonds and mortgages of the subsidiary companies, employees' bonus and pension funds, corporation excise tax, Federal income tax, and excess-profits tax, amounted to slightly more than \$2,817,000,000. Of this amount some \$574,000,000 were set aside for depre-

¹ Judge Gary expressed the opinion that there would be a heavy increase in labor-costs under the three-shift system. He pointed out that a number of steel plants have changed back to the two-shift system after experimenting with three shifts.

ciation, depletion, sinking and replacement funds, leaving \$2,243,000,000 as the net income for nineteen years.¹

Out of this net income a total of \$1,002,000,000 has been paid in dividends. A regular 7 per cent dividend on preferred stock has been paid each year. The dividends on common stock have been as follows: two years no dividends were paid on common stock, one year $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, three years 2 per cent, one year 3 per cent, one year $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, two years 4 per cent, six years 5 per cent, one year $8\frac{3}{4}$ per cent, one year 14 per cent, one year 18 per cent—making an average for these years of a fraction less than 5 per cent on common stock, and 7 per cent on preferred stock. Regular 5 per cent interest has been paid on bonds.

The total net amount expended for additional property, and construction and development work, amounts to more than \$991,000,000.

As far back as 1911, Mr. Herbert Knox Smith, United States Commissioner of Corporations, in referring to the Steel Corporation, said:—

During the period from April, 1901, to December 31, 1910, the Corporation has made an additional net investment in its properties of no less than \$504,928,653. Of this amount, roughly, \$435,000,000 was virtually provided from earnings. These amounts, it should be noted, are over and above the allowance for ordinary maintenance repairs and for actual net depreciation.

In his recent book, *United States Steel: A Corporation with a Soul*,—the library copy of this book which the present writer consulted bears the inscription: “Presented by Elbert H. Gary,”—Mr. Arundel Cotter says in this connection: “Practically all this gain in production has been attained by ‘ploughing’ profits back into addi-

¹ These figures were secured by adding the totals of earnings in the nineteen annual reports of the Corporation.

tions and improvements. Practically all expenditures for extensions have been from earnings. Approximately \$900,000,000 have been expended in this manner."

At the end of 1920, the total undivided surplus of the Steel Corporation amounted to more than \$523,000,000.

OVERCAPITALIZATION

Another factor must be considered. At the time of its formation the Corporation was heavily overcapitalized. In this connection, Mr. Herbert Knox Smith, United States Commissioner of Corporations, said:—

In 1901 the fair market value of its tangible property was about \$700,000,000, slightly less than one half of its capitalization. The figures show clearly that the entire issue of approximately \$508,000,000 of common stock of the Steel Corporation in 1901 had no physical property back of it; and also a considerable fraction, say from one fifth to two fifths, of the preferred stock was likewise unprotected by physical property. Even granting that there may have been a considerable value in intangible considerations, it is reasonably clear that at least the entire issue of common stock, except in so far as what may be termed "merger value" may be considered, represented nothing but "water."

In his book, Mr. Cotter admits that the common stock of the Corporation "had nothing behind it but blue sky." He says that this claim "has never been denied and probably cannot be."¹

In spite of the fact that this issue of \$508,000,000 of common stock was all "water," regular dividends have been paid upon it. During the nineteen years, the total amount of dividends paid on this "watered" common

¹ Judge Gary said to the present writer that, if "good-will" and other considerations were taken into account, he did not think the Corporation was overcapitalized at the time of its organization.

stock amounts to more than \$480,000,000.¹ We are not attempting to say that this common stock is heavily watered at the present time. We are merely pointing out the fact that it has value only because more than \$900,000,000 of earnings have been "ploughed" back. If the Corporation had not been heavily overcapitalized, a large part of this \$900,000,000 could have been paid out in increased wages to unskilled workers, without jeopardizing the financial position of the Corporation.²

SUMMARY OF EARNINGS

Let us summarize these figures: total earnings in nineteen years, \$2,817,000,000; total net income, \$2,243,000,000; total dividends, \$1,002,000,000—7 per cent on preferred stock and 5 per cent on common stock, including \$480,000,000 on common stock, which was originally all "water"; 5 per cent on bonds; a total of \$574,000,000 set aside for depreciation, depletion, sinking and replacement funds; a total of more than \$900,000,000 from earnings "ploughed" back, in the form of new property and improvements.

The average net income of the Corporation from 1901 to the end of 1920, after deducting all operating expenses, ordinary maintenance and repairs, and generous appropriations for depreciation, depletion and sinking funds, was approximately \$118,000,000 per year. This means that the returns on the \$868,000,000 of common and preferred stock have been at the rate of approximately 13½ per cent annually—this in spite of the fact that originally more than half of this stock was "pure water."

¹ See Cotter, p. 308. His figure of approximately \$455,000,000, plus the \$25,000,000 paid on common stock in 1920, gives the above figure.

² Mr. W. J. Filbert, Comptroller of the Corporation, emphatically disagrees with this statement.

If the rate of return on capital stock had been reduced to 10 per cent, the additional amount available for wages would have been more than \$30,000,000 annually; and if the rate had been reduced to 7 per cent, the additional amount available for wages would have been more than \$56,000,000 annually. Either of these sums would have gone a long way toward making possible the abolition of the twelve-hour day, and raising the wages of unskilled workers to a point where they could maintain a decent standard of living.

CAUSES OF LOW WAGES AND LONG HOURS

Why, then, does the Corporation continue to pay its unskilled workers about \$340 a year less than a minimum health and decency standard, and in normal times compel approximately 70,000 of its employees to work the twelve-hour day?

The first reason is, because it follows the usual procedure of not basing wages upon the needs of the workers but upon the market rate. The market rate is paid for labor as for any material commodity. The size of the Corporation enables it to play an important part in determining the market rate. Unskilled workers can now be secured for 30 cents an hour, and therefore it is not necessary to pay a higher wage. Judge Gary told the present writer that he regards it as utterly impracticable to base wages upon family budgets. He said that wages respond to the law of supply and demand.

The second reason is that, from the viewpoint of the management, it is more important to pay regular dividends, and to build up a huge reserve than it is to pay workers in excess of the market rate, even though this rate is insufficient for the maintenance of a decent or comfortable standard of life. Judge Gary said that capital

invested in manufacturing properties is entitled to a return of 15 per cent annually, and pointed out that the earnings of many manufacturing concerns are greatly in excess of this rate. He said that the Steel Corporation could not afford to raise wages, since this would reduce the returns on capital below a fair rate, that is, below 13 to 15 per cent.

The third reason is that adequate pressure has not been brought to bear upon the Steel Corporation by the workers themselves or by public opinion.

LABOR POLICY

What is the labor policy of the Corporation? On June 17, 1901, six weeks after the Corporation was organized, the Executive Committee passed the following resolution:—

That we are unalterably opposed to any extension of union labor, and advise subsidiary companies to take a firm position when these questions come up, and say that they are not going to recognize it—that is, any extension of unions in mills where they do not now exist; that great care should be used to prevent trouble, and that they promptly report and confer with this Corporation.

This policy has been rigidly adhered to. "Whereas, in 1901, one third of the Corporation's mills dealt with unions, in 1919 these and all other unions had been ousted; no unions were dealt with." Judge Gary, the Chairman, refused to confer with representatives of the American Federation of Labor in the face of an imminent strike, even when requested to do so by President Wilson.

On April 18, 1921, Judge Gary thus expressed his attitude toward unions:—

As stated and repeated publicly, we do not combat, though we do not contract or deal with, labor unions as such. Per-

sonally, I believe they may have been justified in the long past, for I think the workmen were not always treated justly; that because of their lack of experience or otherwise, they were unable to protect themselves, and therefore needed the assistance of outsiders in order to secure their rights. But whatever may have been the condition of employment in the long past, and whatever may have been the results of unionism, concerning which there is at least much uncertainty, there is at present, in the opinion of the large majority of both employers and employees, no necessity for labor unions; and that no benefit or advantage through them will accrue to anyone except the union-labor leaders.

Some years ago Mr. Andrew Carnegie, in his *Gospel of Wealth*, said:—

Now the poorest laborer in America or in England, or indeed throughout the civilized world, who can handle a pick or shovel, stands upon equal terms with the purchaser of his labor. He sells or withholds, as it may seem best to him. He negotiates, and thus rises to the dignity of an independent contractor. Not only has the laborer conquered his political and personal freedom, he has achieved industrial freedom as well.

It will be worth while to look into this matter a little further. Does the unskilled worker, with his "pick or shovel," stand upon equal terms with the United States Steel Corporation? Does he "negotiate" and has he "the dignity of an independent contractor"?

POWER OF THE CORPORATION

In attempting to answer this question, let us consider the size and strength of the Steel Corporation. Its total assets are listed at \$2,430,000,000. Its gross volume of business during 1920 was \$1,755,000,000. It owns 145 steel works, approximately 800,000 acres of coal and coke

properties, 993 miles of railway, 1470 locomotives, and 112 steamers.

In addition to these huge holdings, the Corporation is represented in many other industries. Some years ago, an investigating committee of the House of Representatives found that

one or more of the directors of the Steel Corporation are also directors in terminal, steamship, express, and telegraph companies having a total capitalization of \$1,271,778,890; in industrial corporations with a combined capitalization of \$2,803,509,348; and in banks and trust companies having a capital surplus, and undivided profits aggregating \$3,314,811,178; of \$18,417,132,238 invested in railways of the United States, the directors of the United States Steel Corporation have a voice in the directorates of, or act as executive officers of, railroad companies with a total capitalization or bonded indebtedness of \$10,365,071,833.

The policies of the Corporation are determined by a Board of Directors, composed of thirteen members in 1921, and a Finance Committee of six members. The total number of stockholders is over 100,000, but a majority of the stock is held by less than 2 per cent of the stockholders. The vast majority of the stockholders take no active part whatever in determining policies. Actual control is in the hands of the thirteen directors, six of whom are also members of the Finance Committee.

The degree of this control was brought out by Judge Gary in a recent interview with Mr. Whiting Williams:—

Some years ago, in 1912, I believe, Mr. Charles Cabot of Boston^a arose in a stockholders' meeting and proposed a committee to study the hours of work. I asked him how many shares he had. He replied that he had ten or twenty, I have forgotten which. I reminded him that, as I held the proxies of a majority of the voting shares, I could very easily outvote his

motion. Nevertheless I was glad to vote for it, and so the committee was put into action.¹

This concentration of control is brought out even more vividly in the address of Judge Gary at the annual meeting of the stockholders of the Corporation on April 19, 1920, in these words: "Since the United States Steel Corporation commenced business on April 1, 1901, there have been held, including the present one, nineteen regular and also ten special stockholders' meetings. *I have had the honor of presiding at every one, and of voting the major part of all the outstanding capital stock.* For the confidence reposed and the uniformly courteous treatment accorded I am appreciative and grateful."

CONSEQUENCES OF ANTI-UNION POLICY

In the light of the facts obtained, the Commission of Inquiry of the Interchurch World Movement summarized these consequences as follows:—

Maintaining the non-unionism alternative entailed for the employers, (1) discharging workmen for unionism; (2) black lists; (3) espionage and the hiring of "labor detective agencies" operatives; (4) strike breakers, principally negroes. Maintaining the non-unionism alternative entailed for communities, (1) the abrogation of the right of assembly, the suppression of free speech, and the violation of personal rights (principally in Pennsylvania); (2) the use of state police, state troops and (in Indiana) of the United States army; (3) such activities on the part of constituted authorities and of the press and the pulpit as to make the workers believe that these forces oppose labor. In sum, the actually existent state of the steel industry is a state of latent war over rights of organization conceded by public opinion in other civilized countries.

¹ *Collier's Weekly*, July 23, 1921, p. 7.

CONCLUDING QUESTIONS

The present writer desires to state emphatically that this article is not intended as a specific attack upon the officers and directors of the United States Steel Corporation. This discussion deals with policies and not with personalities. The facts set forth herein are used as conspicuous examples of widely accepted policies and practices in modern business life.

Let us conclude this discussion by asking five fundamental questions upon which the people of America will do well to deliberate.

First: Should labor be regarded as a commodity to be purchased at the lowest possible rate, or should the cost of maintaining a decent and comfortable standard of life be used as the basis of determining the lower rates of wages?

Second: What are the costs to society of driving mothers and children under sixteen into industry because of the inadequacy of the fathers' wage?

Third: Is invested capital ethically entitled to an annual return of 13 per cent, or even 10 per cent, if this involves the payment of inadequate wages to unskilled workers?

Fourth: What should be our attitude toward over-capitalization, the "watering" of stock, and the concealing of profits?

Fifth: What should be our attitude toward employers who hold in their hands an enormous concentration of economic power, and who refuse to bargain collectively with their workers through representatives of the workers' own choice?

The material and spiritual well-being of a large proportion of our population, the stability and prosperity of industry, the growth of real democracy, and the progress of mankind depend upon the answers given to such questions as these.

BOOKS ON CURRENT PROBLEMS

CHRISTIANITY AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

FACTS, PRINCIPLES, PROGRAMS

A Discussion Group Text-Book

Prepared by

Kirby Page, Chairman	F. Ernest Johnson
Leslie Blanchard	David R. Porter
Sherwood Eddy	Florence Simms
Harrison S. Elliott	Olive Van Horn

FOR THE
EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEE
OF THE

COMMISSION ON THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL SERVICE
OF THE

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA

Table of Contents

CHAP.

1. A Divided World
2. Poverty—Misfortune or Blessing?
3. Is Poverty a Serious Problem?
4. Do Great Fortunes Help or Hinder Social Progress?
5. Are Luxuries Antagonistic to Public Welfare?
6. Why Is There Not Enough to Go Around?
7. Does Modern Industry Help or Hinder the Full Development of Human Beings?
8. How Can Industry Be Made to Produce More Goods and Better People?
9. How Should Industry Be Controlled?
10. How Much Public Interference with Industry Is Desirable?
11. How Much Progress Toward a Christian Economic Order Can Be Achieved in This Generation?

INVALUABLE FOR PERSONAL STUDY
DISCUSSION GROUPS AND OPEN FORUMS

50 cents per copy

THE CHURCH AND INDUSTRIAL RECONSTRUCTION

BY

THE COMMITTEE ON THE WAR AND THE RELIGIOUS OUTLOOK

Table of Contents

CHAP.

1. The Christian Ideal for Society
2. Unchristian Aspects of the Present Industrial Order
3. The Christian Attitude Toward the System as a Whole
4. The Christian Method of Social Betterment
5. Present Practicable Steps Toward a More Christian Industrial Order
6. The Question of the Longer Future
7. What Individual Christians Can Do to Christianize the Industrial Order
8. What the Church Can Do to Christianize the Industrial Order
9. The Historic Attitude of the Church to Economic Questions

AN EXCEEDINGLY VALUABLE BOOK

Cloth, \$2.00

Paper Covers, \$1.00

BOOKS ON CURRENT PROBLEMS

CHRISTIANITY AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS	
Federal Council of Churches.....	\$.50
THE CHURCH AND INDUSTRIAL RECONSTRUCTION.....	Cloth, \$2.00; Paper, 1.00
THE ACQUISITIVE SOCIETY	
R. H. Tawney.....	1.50
THE SOCIAL PRINCIPLES OF JESUS	
Walter Rauschenbusch.....	1.15
THE UNTRIED DOOR	
Richard Roberts.....	1.50
INDUSTRY AND HUMAN WELFARE	
William L. Chenery.....	1.75
THE COMING OF COAL	
R. W. Bruère.....	1.00
THE IRON MAN	
Arthur Pounds.....	1.75
THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF WORK AND WEALTH	.85
THE SOCIAL FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH	
Malcolm Spencer.....	1.00
EVERYBODY'S WORLD	
Sherwood Eddy.....	1.90
THE NEW SOCIAL ORDER	
H. F. Ward.....	2.50
LABOUR IN THE COMMONWEALTH	
G. D. H. Cole.....	1.50
PROPOSED ROADS TO FREEDOM	
Bertrand Russell.....	1.50
PROPERTY	
Bishop Gore, and others.....	2.00
ECONOMICS FOR THE GENERAL READER	
Henry Clay.....	2.00
DENMARK (On Rural and Agricultural Problems)	
Frederick C. Howe.....	2.00

ORDER THESE BOOKS FROM YOUR BOOKSELLER

OR FROM

KIRBY PAGE, 311 Division Ave., HASBROUCK HEIGHTS, N. J.

56th Thousand

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY, PUBLISHERS
244 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK

- No. 1—INDUSTRIAL FACTS, BY KIRBY PAGE.
Concrete data concerning industrial problems and proposed solutions.
32 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 2—COLLECTIVE BARGAINING, BY KIRBY PAGE.
An ethical evaluation of some phases of trade unionism and the open-shop movement.
32 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 3—FELLOWSHIP, BY BASIL MATHEWS and HARRY BISSEKER.
Preface by Sherwood Eddy.
A consideration of fellowship as a means of building the Christian social order.
32 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 4—THE SWORD OR THE CROSS, BY KIRBY PAGE.
A consideration of the ethics of war between nations and between classes; an analysis of Jesus' way of life.
64 Pages—15 Cents Net
(Regular Edition, \$1.20)
- No. 5—THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION, BY KIRBY PAGE.
An analysis of the social consequences of modern business policies.
24 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 6—AMERICA: HER PROBLEMS AND PERILS, BY SHERWOOD EDDY.
An analysis of outstanding social, industrial, and racial problems.
32 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 7—INCENTIVES IN MODERN LIFE, BY KIRBY PAGE.
Are the motives of Jesus practicable in modern business and professional life?
24 Pages—10 Cents Net

Persons desiring quantities of these pamphlets for use in classes, discussion groups or open forums, or for distribution among their friends, may secure copies of Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 at the rate of 70 cents for ten copies or \$6.00 per hundred, postpaid, and copies of No. 4 in lots of five at 10 cents each, from Kirby Page, 311 Division Avenue, Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey.

8.1
46

Christianity and Industry: Six

K.M.

AMERICA

ITS PROBLEMS AND PERILS

BY
SHERWOOD EDDY

NEW  YORK

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

Ten Cents Net.

COPYRIGHT, 1922,
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY



PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

	PAGE
NATIONAL IDEALS	5
NATIONAL RESOURCES	6
THE POLITICAL PROBLEM	6
THE PROBLEM OF INDUSTRIAL STRIFE	7
THE UNJUST DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH AND INCOME	8
THE OPEN SHOP DRIVE.	10
THE TWELVE-HOUR DAY AND SEVEN-DAY WEEK	12
THE LABOR SPY SYSTEM	13
PROPAGANDA AND THE PRESS.	15
THE RACE PROBLEM	18
THE INTERNATIONAL PROBLEM AND WAR	21
CONCLUSION	24
APPENDIX	26

AUTHOR'S NOTE

The purpose of this pamphlet is to summarize the outstanding problems and perils in America today. It is, of course, impossible to treat each problem adequately in a small pamphlet, as only bare outlines can here be given. No effort is made in this short discussion to deal with the solution of these problems, as this would require several volumes. It may help us to realize the magnitude of the task before us, however, if we seek to mass the evidence on some of the major issues of the hour. The writer realizes that this is not a complete statement of the present situation in America. Volumes might be written upon favorable aspects of our national life which we have not attempted to describe for lack of space. In this pamphlet we have confined ourselves to our "problems and perils," and endeavored to concentrate upon these. The views expressed or positions taken are in no sense official but purely personal and do not represent those of any organization or denomination. The writer holds no brief for either employers or workers. He believes in the common humanity of both. Some of the finest men he has known are among the great hearted employers who are trying earnestly to work out a solution of the industrial problem. He makes no defence for the short sighted and misguided policy of the leaders of some labor unions. Neither does he advocate any easy panacea for the solution of the industrial problem, for he believes that none exists. Rather he looks for gradual, evolutionary progress as we work together in co-operation by the patient application of Christian principles for the solution of all our problems.

AMERICA: ITS PROBLEMS AND PERILS

NATIONAL IDEALS

If we read the great documents that lie at the foundation of our national life, such as the Mayflower Compact, the Bill of Rights of Virginia, the articles of the New England Confederation, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the state papers of Washington, Jefferson and the founders of the nation, three great ideals stand out unmistakably as the very foundation of America's life—Liberty, Justice and Democracy.

The nation was "conceived in Liberty" and many of the original settlers left the old world to escape the oppression of church or state. The nation was founded in Justice with the ideal of equal laws for all, instead of "divine right" for the few. It gradually evolved in the growing conception of Democracy, seeking a government of all the people, by all the people and for all the people. And with these three principles went a high idealism of faith in God and man.

The Mayflower Compact of the Pilgrim Fathers begins: "In the name of God, Amen. We . . . having undertaken, for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian faith . . . a voyage to plant the first colony . . . solemnly and mutually in the presence of God, and one of another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic . . . to enact . . . just and equal laws . . . for the general good." In the New England Confederation, 1643, the colonists state: "We all came into these parts of America with one and the same end, and aim, to advance the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ and to enjoy the liberties of the Gospel in purity with peace."

Was ever a nation more nobly conceived in Liberty, Justice, Democracy and Faith?

Let us think again of the challenge of our vast natural resources and accumulated wealth. The area of the country which is almost as great as the entire continent of Europe, has multiplied five-fold since colonial days, and the population thirty-fold. In the time of Washington we possessed but six cities of 8,000 population, while New York City had but 40,000. Our wealth has increased thirty-five fold since 1850, and is now estimated at approximately two hundred and fifty billion dol-

NATIONAL RESOURCES

lars, or one-third of the world's wealth of seven hundred billions. Judge Gary at the annual meeting of the American Iron and Steel Institute in 1920 showed that while the United States had only six per cent of the world's population and seven per cent of the world's land, yet we were producing 20 per cent of the world's gold, 25 per cent of the world's wheat crop, 40 per cent of the iron, steel, lead and silver of the world, 50 per cent of the zinc, more than 50 per cent of the world's total output of coal, 60 per cent of the copper and aluminum, 60 per cent of the world's cotton crop, 66 per cent of the oil, 75 per cent of the corn, and 85 per cent of the world's production of automobiles. That is, we are producing from one-fifth to four-fifths of most of the world's great essential products. The United States now stands first and leads the world in agriculture, in the production of wheat, oats, corn, tobacco and cotton; first in cattle, hogs and live stock; first in railways, telegraphs and telephones; first in manufactures, and first in inventions and progress, with some 40,000 new patents a year.¹

But what is the significance of this vast wealth? The crucial question is what are we doing with it. R. J. Campbell, the well-known English preacher, upon his return to London this year said: "America holds the moral leadership of the world—if she will take it." Let us turn now to this question of moral leadership and face the challenge of the problems and perils which have arisen in large measure from the very rapidity of our economic development.

THE POLITICAL PROBLEM

American cities are noted for their corrupt governments. The notorious Tweed ring of Tammany politicians robbed the city of New York of many millions. The police graft of the city in its most corrupt days of alliance with vice and crime was worth some three hundred thousand dollars a month. The "shame of the cities" and the corrupt political rings and bosses, with consequent bribery, vice and crime, was passed on to Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Louis, Kansas City, Denver, San Francisco, and other cities. Not only was there municipal corruption, but in some states, offices were bought and sold. In Colorado, as described by Judge

¹ For an excellent picture of our country see E. A. Ross, 'What is America?', 1919, 159 pages. An interesting statement of America in terms of horsepower has been made by Dr. Thomas T. Reed, of the United States Bureau of Mines. The real basis of a nation's power is its energy resources. The energy output of an average workman is about one-tenth of one horsepower. The energy expended by a miner in an eight-hour day thus amounts to about that available from two pounds of coal. There are 41,000,000 wage earners in the United States and their energy output is a little more than 4,000,000 horsepower. Taking the estimates of the probable and available power sources of the United States in terms of millions of 'horsepower years,' they are approximately as follows: Coal 500,000, petroleum 400, waterpower 37. No other country has 1/50th part of the total energy resources of the United States.—Baltimore Sun, Mar. 29, 1922.

Lindsey in "The Beast," the corporations controlled the courts, governors and legislatures. To some extent also corruption and the domination of the money power has crept into our national politics. In the 1920 elections thirteen and a half millions were spent on national and state candidates. The expenditure of several hundred thousand dollars on behalf of Senator Newberry was publicly condemned by the Senate which seated him.

In the recent municipal elections across the country the party of "good government" was defeated in most of the cities. A leading social worker in New York said recently: "I would rather vote for Tammany Hall with its known vice and crime, bribery and corruption than for your so-called party of good government which is often controlled by the selfish profiteering of the money power that would sell out the franchises and exploit the people quite as readily and far more successfully than Tammany Hall."

Do not these two dangers constitute the menace of our political problem today—selfish bribery and corruption on the one hand and selfish profiteering on the other? How shall we mobilize the men, true to our American ideals, who cannot be bought or sold, or tempted by profiteering, who will find the solution of our political problem in America?

THE PROBLEM OF INDUSTRIAL STRIFE

There is a new spirit of industrial unrest abroad in the world since the war. America has been averaging over 3,000 strikes a year for the last five years, some five times as many as Great Britain, and more than any other country in the world. A recent writer refers to the "discontent which, driven by an expanding world commercialism, is rising the world over, as naturally, relentlessly and uncontrollably as the tide under the pull of the moon." What is the cause of this world-wide discontent of labor? According to G. D. H. Cole, of Oxford, there are three fundamental causes of industrial unrest in Great Britain. Insecurity of employment, growing discontent to work for the private profit and luxury of the few rather than for the service and need of the many, and labor's resentment at the autocratic control of industry. The employee is too often treated as a commodity, receiving orders from an employer who controls him, but gives him no voice in determining the condition of his working life. Justice Brandeis traces the one fundamental cause of industrial strife to "the contrast between our political liberty and industrial absolutism."

In the Final Report of the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations, the four fundamental causes of unrest in America are stated as follows: "The sources from which this unrest springs group them-

selves almost without exception under four main sources which include all the others:

1. Unjust distribution of wealth and income.
2. Unemployment and denial of an opportunity to earn a living.
3. Denial of justice in the creation, in the adjudication and in the administration of law.
4. Denial of the right and opportunity to form effective organizations."¹ Let us examine some of these alleged causes of our industrial strife.

THE UNJUST DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH AND INCOME

In England it is estimated by Sir Leo Chiozza Money that one-tenth of the people possess nine-tenths of the wealth, the remaining nine-tenths of the people having but one-tenth of the wealth. That would be approximately true in America also. According to Professor W. I. King of the University of Wisconsin, 2% of our people possess some 60% of the wealth; that is, two million persons own twenty per cent more wealth than all the other one hundred million and more people together, while two-thirds of our people have no home of their own, no land, or tools, no secure means of livelihood, no capital except the clothes on their backs and a little furniture and personal belongings.² Mr. Henry H. Klein, Deputy Commissioner of Accounts of New York, in his new book "Dynastic America," gives the names of the hundred families that own or control most of the wealth, the railways and the fourteen great basic industries of America. He names the twelve families that control the oil industry, eleven the steel, five the beef and packing industry and so on through coal, copper, railways, gas, telegraph and telephone, tobacco, rubber, sugar, gun-powder and shipping.³

For illustration, here is a German butcher boy who lands in America and buys a farm. Seven million people move in on this and the surrounding farms on which New York City is built. Today this one favored family possesses, according to Mr. Klein, a fortune of \$500,000,000. They have the share of wealth of over a million of the poor who have an average of some \$400 each in personal possessions. This is not necessarily the fault of the individuals who succeed. We are glad for their success. We are not now finding fault with the individual players under the present rules of the game, but with the rules of the game itself. Let us look for a moment at the condition of the million who are poor. Here in New York are some 270,000 darkened tenement rooms that never see the light of God's sun; one person in twelve is

¹ Reprint from Senate Document 415, p. 30.

² "Wealth and Income," W. I. King, pp. 80, 82.

³ "Dynastic America," H. H. Klein, pp. 11, 12.

buried penniless in the "Potters Field"; one in fourteen evicted, because they cannot pay their rent; from twelve to twenty per cent of the children are under-nourished; thousands are living in stifling slums, in wretched tenements, ill-fed, with high infant mortality, under conditions that crush out the life of body, mind and spirit. Is this God's will for his children, is it humanity, is it justice? Think of the responsibility of growing rich in a poor world, of growing fat while others starve!

The inequality of income in the United States is shown in "Income in the United States" by the National Bureau of Economic Research. Twenty-one million families dividing the available income of the country would average \$2,330 each. But in actual fact 152 persons have an income of over \$1,000,000; 369 persons an income of from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000; 1976 from \$200,000 to \$500,000; 4,945 from \$100,000 to \$200,000; and a total of 254,000 of the rich with incomes of \$10,000 to over \$1,000,000, who receive nearly seven billion dollars of the national income. Only 842,000, or 3 per cent, receive over \$5,000 a year; five millions, or 14 per cent, receive over \$2,000; twenty-seven millions, or 72 per cent, receive less than \$1,500, and fourteen million persons, or 38 per cent, receive less than \$1,000 a year.

Out of these ranks of poverty comes a large proportion of our vice and crime. The system is doubly vicious since those who inherit vast, unearned wealth also furnish an undue proportion of the divorce crime and evil living in our national life. The results of poverty in human life are obvious—crowded tenements, unsanitary surroundings, congested or demoralized family life, sickness, child labor, mothers driven out into industry, ignorance and low mentality, without even an awakened desire for education, ignorant and unskilled workers, untrained and undesirable citizenship, growing class hatred of masses, sodden with misery and despair. As Oliver Cromwell says: "He who makes many poor to make a few rich—that suits not a commonwealth."

We are witnessing in America today perhaps the most vast and dangerous concentration of wealth in the hands of the few that history has ever recorded. In summing up the three volumes of the Pujo Commission of Congress on the money trust, Justice Brandeis pointed out the danger of one financial group in New York which was appointing 341 directors of 112 corporations and thus controlling the railways and the great basic industries of America. They held the concentrated control of twenty-two billions of wealth, which is more than twice the value of all the property of the thirteen Southern States combined, or more than that of the twenty-two States west of the Mississippi taken together.¹

¹ Quoted by L. D. Edie, "Current Social and Industrial Forces," p. 125.

At the other end of the scale, according to the Final Report of the Industrial Relations Commission, 37% of the mothers in industry are forced to work. Two-thirds of the women in the factories up to the outbreak of the war were receiving \$8.00 a week or less and one-half of them \$6.00 a week or less. Over 20,000 persons are killed in industry each year. Of the 700,000 accidents yearly at least half are preventable. In the great basic industries over 2,000,000 are unemployed. Wage earners lose more than one-fifth of their time in unemployment.¹ Ten million live in poverty in normal times in America.² Ten million now living will die prematurely of preventable diseases at the present death rate in this country. The poor are dying at three times the death rate of the well-to-do, and from tuberculosis, at seven times their death rate. From 12 per cent to 20 per cent of the children in the great cities are underfed.³ These conditions inevitably produce the crushed or distorted bodies and minds from which the army of crime is recruited. A Chinese proverb well says: "Crime begins in poverty."

THE OPEN SHOP DRIVE

Another cause of industrial strife as stated in the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations is "the denial of the right and opportunity to form effective organizations." The right of collective bargaining must be viewed as part of a long evolutionary development of humanity. Broadly speaking, both man's political and industrial progress has been won by the assertion of the right of collective bargaining. It has not been handed down gratuitously by the privileged class from above, but won by collective organization from below. Our Anglo-Saxon liberties in the Magna Carta were wrested from selfish privilege by collective action. The freedom of the American colonies, and the French Revolution were won by the same method. In like manner practically all industrial advance has been gained. In primitive society and indeed in America up to 1861, the worker was often owned in slavery as the property of the employer. Under serfdom the worker was bought and sold with the land. Until the Reform Bill in 1831 in England, labor's position was pitiable. Its right to organize to improve its miserable condition was often outlawed until 1825, but steadily, from thenceforward, wages, hours and conditions were improved by collective bargaining.

This right is now freely recognized by the leading religious bodies.

¹ See Final Report of Commission on Industrial Relations in Part II of this pamphlet for these facts.

² See the estimates of Robert Hunter, Prof. Parmelee and J. S. Penman. According to Professor Simms a hundred and eighty men own a quarter of the wealth of the United States. Two hundred men have most of the privately owned timber of America, while three companies control a large part of this. C. R. VanHise, "Concentration and Control," p. 156. Newell L. Simms, "Ultimate Democracy," p. 52.

³ Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations, pp. 24-37.

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, The National Catholic War Council, and the Social Justice Program adopted by the Central Conference of America Rabbis all recognize the right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of its own choosing. Ex-President Taft recognizes labor's right of collective bargaining as "indispensable to its welfare." It is defended by Mr. Herbert Hoover, Secretary Charles E. Hughes, President Roosevelt, and a long list of the best authorities.¹

In spite of this fundamental and elemental human right, we find that some employers in America have been conducting, under the guise of an "open shop" drive, an effort to break the unions. We are glad that this action is deplored by the Merchants Association of New York, and other far sighted groups of employers. Ex-President Taft recently pointed out that: "It is the custom of Bourbon employers engaged in fighting labor unionism to the death to call a closed non-union shop an open shop and to call the movement to kill unionism an open-shop movement. This is a deceitful misuse of the term."²

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has issued a statement in which it is declared that: "The relations between employers and workers throughout the United States are seriously affected at this moment by a campaign which is being conducted for the open shop policy—the so-called American Plan of Employment. These terms are now being frequently used to designate establishments that are definitely anti-union. Obviously, a shop of this kind is not an open shop but a closed shop—closed against members of labor unions." The National Catholic Welfare Council says in this connection: "The 'open shop' drive masks under such names as 'the American Plan' and hides behind the pretense of American freedom. Yet its real purpose is to destroy all effective labor unions, and thus subject the working people to the complete domination of the employers."³

We would gladly recognize the earnest efforts of many employers to find a just solution of the labor problem. The New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, in a report made public January 31, 1922, advises employers to keep clear of the various "open shop" movements. The report shows that there are three roads open to employers; the road of constructive achievement within the shop, that of constructive co-operation between organizations of employers and of workers and that of the "open shop." This last, the committee says, is "undermining the confidence of labor in employers, and ruining the foundation of co-operation between them." It is pointed out that

¹ A full discussion of the subject will be found in the pamphlet, *Collective Bargaining*, by Kirby Page.

² *The Baltimore News*, Feb. 5, 1921.

³ Quoted in "The Open Shop Drive," p. 45.

similar campaigns in former periods of depression have only resulted in the redoubled growth of unionism and adoption of extreme measures in the periods of prosperity which followed.

This "open shop" drive must be recognized as one of our serious American problems. In countries more advanced in industrial justice such as England and on the continent of Europe the right of collective bargaining and labor's right to choose its own representatives where it will, is fully and finally recognized. A considerable number of employers and publicists in the United States also fully recognize the necessity for collective action on the part of the workers, and many firms and corporations are experimenting with various types of collective bargaining. The denial of this right may not only perpetuate growing industrial unrest, but cause those acute and violent outbreaks of labor which have been witnessed in other countries that have followed the discredited methods of reaction and repression,

THE TWELVE-HOUR DAY AND SEVEN-DAY WEEK

Countries with a more enlightened labor policy have long ago adopted the practice of a maximum eight-hour day. The forty-four or forty-eight hour week is almost universal in Great Britain. According to Horace B. Drury in the *Bulletin of the Taylor Society*,¹ there are still seven different industries in the United States where from 15,000 to 150,000 men in each are working a twelve-hour day and in many cases a seven-day week. Thus in the steel industry, Mr. Drury estimates 150,000 men who still have no alternative to the twelve-hour day. Including their families this involves the welfare of half a million people. If, as in England and other countries, the work were placed on three shifts of eight hours each, Mr. Drury estimates that at most it would increase the cost of the steel but 3%, or the price per ton from \$40.00 to only \$41.20. Yet in many instances he shows that an eight-hour shift has actually increased the relative output by as much as 20%.

The Interchurch Steel Report shows that approximately half the employees in the steel plants of the United States Steel Corporation were working the twelve-hour day, or the eleven to fourteen-hour shift, and that less than one-quarter were working under sixty hours a week. They were averaging twenty hours a week more than the workers in the steel industry of Great Britain. Modern science has recognized the imperative need of exercising the neglected faculties after

¹ Taylor Society Bulletin, Feb. 1921. As we go to press, the news comes of President Harding's banquet on May 18th, 1922 with forty-one steel executives at which the President "insisted that the industry meet if possible what seemed to be a strong public sentiment" and abolish the twelve-hour day. For more than a decade public opinion has been demanding such a change and it now seems likely that the steel companies will have to yield to the demand. This gives us hope that public opinion may bring about the removal of other evils mentioned in this pamphlet.

the grinding monotony of toil to offset the tyranny of industry over human life.

The very worst conditions are found in the cities that produce the most wealth. The writer spoke to one worker who had come out of the twelve-hour day and the seven-day week, which Herbert Hoover calls "sheer inhumanity." He told of the three fears hanging over the workers. First, there was the dread of unemployment. He said that they would work a twelve-hour day and work until they dropped rather than run the risk of losing their jobs in this dreaded time of unemployment. Second, there was the fear of accident from the giant machines. One worker described to the writer how first the machine crushed his hand, later broke his nose and still later his arm until he was discharged after the third accident. But greatest of all was the fear of the breaking up of the home. The man who works twelve hours a day, who has but two hours a day to himself and goes home to eat and sleep like an animal, cannot protect his wife and children. His life centers in the shop, not the home; and his daughters are on the streets and in the dance halls. Immorality stalks into these homes and exploits the daughters of the poor. How long is this blot of a twelve-hour day and a seven-day week to continue in our American life?

THE LABOR SPY SYSTEM

Judge Anderson in giving his decision in the recent Colyer case said: "Spies are necessarily drawn from the unwholesome and untrustworthy classes. A right minded man refuses such a job. The spy system destroys confidence and propagates hate."¹

William J. Burns himself complains of detectives that "as a class they are the biggest lot of blackmailing thieves that ever went unwhipped of justice."¹

The second volume of the Interchurch Report, "Public Opinion and the Steel Strike," speaks of the "widespread systems of espionage as an integral part of the anti-union policy of great industrial corporations." In one company investigated, "the file, the repository of this concern's labor intelligence and the basis of its labor policy, freely offered into the investigator's hands, turned out to contain some 600 reports by under-cover men (spies) together with black-lists, letters to and from other strike-bound steel companies in Monessen and to the Federal government, and contracts with labor detective agencies." . . . "War, periodically overt, generally chronic, was what the Commission found in the steel industry."²

In speaking of the labor spy system now so widespread in American

¹ "The Labor Spy" by Sidney Howard. Introduction by R. C. Cabot, p. 56.

² "Public Opinion and the Steel Strike," pp. 1, 2, 3.

industry, Dr. Richard C. Cabot of Harvard, says: "It promotes widespread and perpetual suspicion. A workman cannot tell whom to trust. He cannot by law-abiding behaviour rid himself of the torment and degradation inherent in endless distrust of his fellows. The labor spy is led into a treachery more chronic and more deeply resented than that of any other spy, because his work is more continuous and because his victims have committed no crime and are planning none. . . . "There is no knowing where to find him or how to get rid of him. Because of him all men are suspected, and intense bitterness is aroused against employers, the innocent and the guilty alike. . . . The whole matter seems to me not one of persons or classes but of a very widespread human tendency to go back to barbaric methods of deception and treachery and to break down the distinction between war, which we know is hell, and peace, which we have supposed to be something different. . . . Hired to cheat the employee, the spy finds it profitable to cheat his employer too, by fomenting strikes so that he may be hired to break them. . . . Violence and the work of the agent provocateur seem the logical outcome of any spy system pursued for profit only. The remedy as I see it is light. I do not believe that the labor spy system can stand the scrutiny of the public. When the nation realizes what is going on it will turn to other and less barbaric methods of dealing with industrial unrest."¹

This survey of industrial espionage gives evidence of the working of the various labor spy agencies. The Sherman Service, Inc., paid an income tax of \$258,000 in a year out of its profits for this pernicious spy system. One of its avowed purposes was to "stir up as much bad feeling as possible between the Italians and the Serbs," and to "call up racial hatred between the two." The Baldwin-Felts Company seems to be ready to furnish gunmen, fighters and machine guns whenever necessary to break a strike in Colorado, West Virginia or other industrially backward states.

If we read this amazing account of a spy system which has spread its slimy octopus tentacles through much of American industry, one wonders whether one is in Czarist Russia instead of free America. The fact is that such methods and a spy system obtain only in times of war. It means industrial and class war if such a method is continued. The spy system was long ago outgrown and abandoned in favor of more enlightened methods in Great Britain. Thus we read, just one hundred years ago, between 1800 and 1820 in England "the use of spies was common in all times of upper class panic."²

What is to be our attitude toward such a spy system in American industry and what solution can we find for it? A director of the firm

¹ "The Labor Spy". Introduction by R. C. Cabot, pp. 3, 4, 5.

² Hammond, "The Town Laborer," p. 258.

of Kuppenheimer Brothers, clothing manufacturers of Chicago, has shown the utter failure and futility of the spy system in the days when his firm practiced it, stating that he had never known a spy's report to contain any information of value. How much better for the firms in the clothing industry to have advanced to a stable constitutionalism in industry, with a written constitution, the frank recognition of the unions, and the successful operation of the agreement with the Amalgamated, instead of the old system of war and spies. Is not the solution of the spy system the growth of constitutionalism in industry and the recognition of the right of employer and employee alike to organize for their mutual welfare and to bargain collectively?

PROPAGANDA AND THE PRESS

The press in America constitutes another great problem. Mr. Walter Lippman in "Liberty and the News" shows that the first issue of the first newspaper printed in the United States was written "toward curing that spirit of lying that prevails amongst us." It was immediately suppressed. But never was there greater need of the spirit of truth than in America today. The very life of democracy depends upon publicity and the press is one of the major channels of publicity.¹ Mr. Frank I. Cobb, the editor of the *New York World* shows the evil effect of the war upon the press: "For five years there has been no true play of public opinion in the world. Multitudes have been willing to die for their country but not to think for it." Out of all the troubled areas of the world streams of propaganda are converging upon us. The world war has long victimized both sides by a distorted propaganda.

The race riots in Omaha, Washington and elsewhere were stirred up by the propaganda of the press. General Wood upon his arrival in Omaha showed that one of the first steps to law and order was the suppression of a "rotten press" which had been fomenting race hatred for weeks.

One living in the foul atmosphere of a stifling room soon ceases to be aware of the poison which is benumbing his senses. Probably many of us have never recognized the menace of our public press. A student recently won an oratorical contest on the press as a "Maker of Wars." He might have added "Maker of Crime." Barring certain shining exceptions, how many cities in the United States can be found today where the press is giving adequately the world's news and only "the news that's fit to print" without the vulgar, criminal

¹ John Macy, in "Civilization in the United States," says of the press: "No other institution approaches the newspaper in universality, persistence, continuity of influence. Compared with the journalist, the teacher, the preacher, the artist, the politician, the man of science, are restricted, interrupted, indirect in reaching the minds of their fellowmen."

or sensational. If you take Chicago and all the cities of the middle west dependent upon it, you have a newspaper claiming to be the greatest on earth which is throughout typified by its motto "Right or wrong, my country" not of course that right matters particularly! The only alternative to this morning paper is one of the Hearst papers, in that stream of poisoned yellow journalism that now stretches throughout America from coast to coast; that would drag us on the one hand into war with England, on the other into war with Japan, and on the south into war with Mexico. These are the alternatives of reading matter presented in the morning papers to the people of that great crime-infested city of Chicago. How far is such a press responsible for these disgraceful conditions of hold-ups, automobile bandits, widespread divorce and crime?

We admit that the taste and demands of the public must share with the newspapers the responsibility for our press today. Nevertheless take up any city newspaper and make an analysis of it. To make a test the writer took at random a copy of what he believes is considered the best paper in Pittsburgh—*The Gazette Times*. He found in the paper a few meagre scraps of utterly inadequate world news and one really good syndicated article by Frank Simonds, but these were the eighteen points that he noticed in the paper before he reached the first railway junction:

1. A suicide, first column.
2. Fatty Arbuckle; his own statement of his hog party.
3. An account of the French Landru who had murdered ten women and seduced 283.
4. Murder of a woman by a negro Thomas.
5. Liquor evasions and thefts.
6. Paulist Father Kennedy warns America of 110,000 cases of divorce in the United States in a year, leaving 300,000 children uncared for; America now leading the world in divorce.
7. Murder of a miner near Pittsburgh.
8. Philadelphia liquor frauds of \$1,500,000.
9. The disreputable Stillman divorce case resumes "its last American phase."
10. A bank hold-up.
11. Woman murders a man and gives her testimony in court.
12. Death in the chair of a Philadelphia man for murdering the illegitimate child of his wife.
13. Mary Pickford's divorce from Moore.
14. Another divorce scandal.
15. Judge arrested in the South for complicity in 250 cases of whiskey stolen.
16. Assault and murder of a girl of fourteen.

17. Protest against the deliberately false statement of a reporter regarding the French lady tennis champion.
18. Question of professionalism in athletics in one of our leading colleges.¹

As the writer had just come from three colleges within a week where the honor system had broken down and had been given up because there was not enough honor left to carry it, and from several colleges where there was an alarming growth of professionalism in athletics the last article seemed significant. Now let us take this newspaper, not as the worst, but what claims to be the best in a great city like Pittsburgh. Would such a paper tend to be an educator of the public, a maker of morals and of high standards, or would it tend to be a maker of crime and of vulgar life? When Mr. Seebohm Rowntree was touring in this country, he was asked by a leading newspaper man what he thought of the American press. He tried, out of courtesy, to avoid a reply, but when forced to give a frank answer he stated his opinion of the press in America today as "damnably rotten." Did he speak the truth, or have we been breathing this poisoned atmosphere so long that we have ceased to realize it?

The Associated Press and other news services are not independent organizations feeding news to their clients, but simply interrelated newspapers exchanging materials. The Denver newspapers control all the news that is read in the country about the Colorado coal mines. The Boston newspapers control all the news that is read in San Francisco about the New England textile mills.

Everett Dean Martin, in his "Behavior of Crowds," says: "I know of nothing which today so menaces the values of civilization, as the growing habit of behaving as crowds. Our society is becoming a veritable babel of gibbering crowds. Not only are mob outbreaks and riots increasing in number, but every interest, patriotic, religious, ethical, political, economic, easily degenerates into a confusion of propagandist tongues, into extravagant partisanship, and intemperance."

"The leader in crowd-thinking par excellence is the daily newspaper. With few exceptions our journals emit hardly anything but crowd ideas. Newspaper-democracy demands that everything more exalted than the level of the lowest cranial attitude be left out. The average result is a deluge of sensational scandal, class prejudice, and special pleading clumsily disguised with a saccharine smear of the cheapest moral platitude."

The Interchurch Report on Public Opinion and the Steel Strike stated: "A feature of the strike was the fact that no newspaper in Pittsburgh took a stand for freedom of speech and a just enforcement

¹ *Gazette Times*, Pittsburgh, Nov. 29, 1921.

of the law." . . . "By adding the newspaper estimates and predictions of the 'men who had returned to work' a statistically-minded union official of Youngstown, O., at one time proved that the newspapers of the Pittsburgh district had informed the public that 2,400,000 men had 'gone back to work' in the steel industry, in which 50,000 are normally employed." The report concludes, "It is inconceivable that the public which relied on the Pittsburgh newspapers could, by any human method of reading newspapers and allowing both for exaggeration due to bias and inaccuracy due to haste, have understood either the causes of the steel strike or the significance of its incidents."

The Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations warns us of the danger of the growing social unrest, owing to the police suppression of free speech in America.¹

We have not time to trace the long fight for freedom of speech painfully won through the centuries. The great philosophers from Socrates to Spinoza and Locke have fought for it. The great English writers from Milton to Macaulay and John Stewart Mill, and in America from Emerson and James Russell Lowell to the present have staunchly defended free speech. Our political leaders from Jefferson, Adams and the Continental Congress of 1774, and from Webster and Lincoln to the present day have held to this right. Are we now to sell our birthright of the heritage of free speech for the mess of pottage of propaganda and the modern press?

THE RACE PROBLEM

Mr. H. G. Wells asserts: "I am convinced myself that there is no more evil thing in this present world than race prejudice; none at all! I write deliberately—it is the worst single thing in life now. It justifies and holds together more baseness, cruelty and abomination than any other sort of error in the world."

Roughly, one third of the world's population, or 550,000,000, is white, about a third is yellow, and a third black and brown. That is, two-thirds of mankind are colored. Does not this imply that a belief in humanity involves a belief in colored people? Let us pause to ask whether we believe in humanity as such, or whether we believe merely in our favored class or clique or group or nation or race, as, "Germany over all," "America first," "My country right or wrong," "White supremacy," etc. Or do we believe that, "Above all nations is humanity."

To appreciate the significance of the race problem and our responsibility to the Negroes, we must remember that they were dragged here in slavery by ourselves. For nearly four centuries the continent

¹ Final Report, Commission on Industrial Relations, p. 98.

of Africa was ravaged by slave traders from "Christian" nations. Villages were burned, thousands were killed; those surviving were driven down to the slave pens on the coast. Sir John Hawkins, knighted by Queen Elizabeth, opened up the lucrative slave trade for Great Britain in his good ship "The Jesus"! Chained below decks, wallowing in inconceivable filth, the average slaver lost a large number of its human cargo on the voyage. New York City alone was importing slaves at the rate of many thousands a year, and the North was particularly guilty in the matter of the slave trade. After holding them in slavery for over two centuries, we flung them free in economic poverty, in illiteracy, with terrific economic handicaps.

Let us face the seriousness of our record of lawlessness in America. Ex-President Taft, speaking before the New York Civic Forum in 1908, declared that there had been since 1885 2,286 legal executions, yet during the same period 131,951 cases of murder and homicide. Since 1885 we have put to death over 4,096 by lynching and mob violence, or an average of two a week or over 100 every year. This is not a sectional matter, as all but five states in the union have been implicated. Has any nation in the world such a record? During the writer's life in Asia, in twenty-five years he never knew of a case of lynching in Japan, China, India, or the lands where he worked. He has not met with lynching in Europe. It is not practiced in South America. In the British Empire, where the whites are outnumbered more than five to one, or in the West Indies where they are outnumbered twenty to one, the writer has never known of a single case of lynching. Even since the Dyer Bill was introduced into Congress to end this national disgrace, more than fifty new cases of lynching have already occurred.¹ America is held up to ridicule in the press both of Europe and Asia as the one country that continues this barbarous, inhuman and unchristian practice. Rabindranath Tagore in answer to a question regarding Christian missions said that so long as lynching continued to take place in America he did not think that the American people had enough brotherhood to warrant their trying to export it. Lynching at home is a serious hindrance to Christian missions abroad.

Governor Dorsey, at a Conference of Citizens in Atlanta, April 22, 1921, courageously spoke of the four wrongs to which he considered the Negro was subjected in the State of Georgia, as typical of other states. His published statement includes: 1. "The Negro lynched. 2. The Negro held in peonage. 3. The Negro driven out by organized lawlessness. 4. The Negro subjected to individual acts of cruelty."

It is often maintained that lynching is necessary to prevent the

¹ There is imperative necessity for remedial legislation to insure speedy trials and avoid useless delay in the administration of justice.

unmentionable crime, but as a matter of fact, in less than one-fifth of the cases was this alleged or even suspected. A noble statement was made by the leading women in the churches of Georgia, assembled to form a woman's section of the State Inter-Racial Committee. It is in part as follows: "We have a deep sense of appreciation for the chivalry of men who would give their lives for the purity and safety of the women of their own race, yet . . . we find in our hearts no extenuation for crime, be it violation of womanhood, mob-violence, or the illegal taking of human life. We are convinced that if there is any crime more dangerous than another, it is that crime which strikes at the root of and undermines constituted authority, breaks all laws and restraints of civilization, substitutes mob-violence and masked irresponsibility for established justice, and deprives society of a sense of protection against barbarism. Therefore, we believe that no falser appeal can be made to southern manhood than that mob-violence is necessary for the protection of womanhood, or that the brutal practice of lynching and burning of human beings is an expression of chivalry. We believe that these methods are no protection to anything or anybody, but that they jeopardize every right and every security that we possess." This action of the women of Georgia has been followed by a similar pronouncement from the women of Alabama and Tennessee who have also organized a woman's section of the Inter-Racial Committee.

The fanning to flame of race prejudice by propaganda and the press has been one cause leading to race war and riots. Lawless mobs and shooting have occurred in cities like Washington, Chicago, East St. Louis, Omaha, Tulsa, Atlanta, Springfield, Chester and near riots in a number of other places that might be added. In East St. Louis 6000 Negroes were driven from their homes and 700 shot, burned or beaten in the race war there. Are these to continue periodically? If not what is the solution?

Let us take a typical case. Here is a little Negro boy Booker Washington. What shall we do with this boy? We can do one of two things. One is to "keep him in his place." What place? The place we usually assign Negroes; consisting of poverty, illiteracy, unsanitary surroundings? That breeds disease, death and crime; and we suffer the consequences. As Emerson said: "If I put a chain on a slave I fix the other end around my own neck." Suppose we give the Negro boy a place such as the teaching of Jesus implies. Let us give him a fair chance by a practical, technical or liberal education. Out from Tuskegee and Hampton Institutes, from Fisk, Howard, Lincoln, Atlanta and other colleges have come over 7000 Negro college graduates, a small army of useful citizens, trained in agriculture, industry, science and domestic skill, who have led their race in a remarkable

record in the span of a single short generation after slavery. Dr. Anson Phelps Stokes in his Hampton Institute Founders' Day Address in 1922 stated: "That the Negro in just over half a century should have increased his homes owned from 12,000 to 650,000, farms operated from 20,000 to 1,000,000, businesses conducted from 2000 to 165,000, literacy from 10 percent to 80 percent, teachers from 600 to 43,000, voluntary contributions to education from \$80,000 to \$2,700,000, churches from 700 to 45,000, Sunday school pupils from 50,000 to 2,250,000, church property from \$1,500,000 to \$90,000,000—this is an extraordinary record full of reassurance to those who like to believe in human improbability. During this difficult period of readjustment the Negro has maintained his religious faith, increased his thrift, improved his capacity as a skilled workman and developed self-respecting Christian homes."

President Harding, in his speech in Birmingham, asked for the Negro, that he should have an equal vote, that he should have the privilege of education, and that he should receive economic justice. We have traveled a long distance since Chief Justice Taney could say that "the negro has no rights which the white man is bound to respect."

Fortunately, we are standing at the dawn of a new day, of a slowly awakening conscience on race relations. Inter-Racial Committees have already been organized in more than six hundred of the seven hundred and fifty-nine counties where Negroes are found in large numbers. This movement for co-operation is one of the most encouraging of our time. Solutions worked out in America will make a contribution to the race problem throughout the world.

What principles can we apply to solve our difficult and delicate race problem? Do we believe in democracy? For whom? We believe apparently in a single system of taxation and conscription and in a double standard of morals, of citizenship and of society. How far do we really believe in the application of Christian brotherhood? With what race does it terminate?¹

THE INTERNATIONAL PROBLEM AND WAR

In addition to her internal problems the nation must face the issue of international relationships and the question of war. A generation ago we faced the question of slavery and ended it. Today we must

¹ For further information upon the problem of race relations see "Present Forces in Negro Progress," Weatherford; "The Negro Faces America," J. Seligman; "The Souls of Black Folk," Dr. W. E. B. DuBois; "A Short History of the American Negro," Benjamin G. Brawley; "A Social History of the American Negro," Benjamin G. Brawley; "The Negro in Literature and Art," Benjamin G. Brawley; "The Trend of the Races," George E. Haynes, *Missionary Education Movement*, 1922; "Up From Slavery," Booker T. Washington; "Finding a Way Out," Major R. R. Moton; "A History of the Negro Church," Carter G. Woodson; "The Basis of Ascendancy," E. G. Murphy; "Black and White," L. H. Hammond; *The Journal of Negro History*, a quarterly, 1218 U Street, Washington, D. C.

face the greater evil of war. What is to be our attitude upon this moral problem?

In the light of the present world situation and the results of the war, I believe that modern warfare, as a means of settling international differences, is wrong, for the following reasons:

1. Because of the inevitable wholesale destruction of human life. Ten millions of the flower of the world's youth lie buried on the battlefields of Europe. The writer passed from Ypres to Verdun where upwards of half a million graves mark the dead on each of these battlefields. These men were killed in such a way as often to cause horrible suffering and to brutalize some of those who did the killing.

2. Because of the inevitable wholesale destruction of non-combatants and the havoc wrought upon whole populations. The limitations and restrictions of war are soon swept away. It is not professional soldiers but whole populations who are now in conflict. Thirty millions of non-combatants have already been killed by those five camp-followers of modern war—further wars, revolution, hunger, famine and disease. This "war that was to end war" left a score of small wars in its train. The habit of killing and reliance upon force leads also to revolution. The great revolution in Russia, the smaller revolutions in other countries, the Red and White Terror that have followed alternately in Finland, Hungary and other lands, must add their death toll to the list. Hunger, under-nourishment, and wide-spread infant mortality have carried away large numbers of the population. A hundred thousand students and professors were left in want in Europe. According to Herbert Hoover, a hundred millions, or one-quarter of the population of Europe, were left with no adequate means of support.

Famine also follows in the wake of war. The Russian famine, aggravated by the breakdown of the transport and the lack of supplies owing to the war, caused the death of millions. Disease stalks behind famine and war. Typhus swept away two hundred and fifty thousand in Poland alone. Tuberculosis has multiplied. Pneumonia, influenza, and other war scourges have swept around the world.

3. Because of the enormous material loss, the waste and destruction of wealth, and the burden of debt left upon the nations. The direct cost of the Great War is estimated to have been 186 billions of dollars, or seven times that of all wars combined from the French Revolution to the present. The late war has impoverished the world. The national debts of the world, given in dollars, have increased as follows: that of France has increased eightfold, mortgaging half her wealth; the debt of Germany increased fifteenfold, representing far more than half her wealth; that of England increased twelvefold; while the

United States increased its debt nearly twenty-fivefold. The total debts of the nations of the world were multiplied about tenfold.

4. Because war inevitably engenders hatred, cruelty, reprisals, atrocities and counter-atrocities. After we have called forth the demon of hate, we cannot exorcise and expel it. A campaign to create fear, appealing to race and national pride, calls out the worst traits of human nature. This hatred, suspicion and division does not cease with war. It has led to the economic breakdown of Europe and much of the world. In one part of the world men were starving for want of corn, while in another part, it was being burned. The war shattered many of the co-operative processes upon which modern civilization depends. Added to all this, is the evident fact that war is well-nigh futile as a means of solving problems. At best it sows dragons' teeth, raising new problems for every one that it settles.

It is becoming ever more destructive and barbarous. Take the last American inventions at the close of the war. While the "Big Bertha" as a mere "stunt" dropped a tiny shell at a distance of seventy miles, the new American aerial torpedo drops an enormous bomb, of high explosive or poison gas, hitting a mark at a distance of a hundred miles. They could blow up London from Paris or blot out Paris from London. Combine this with the new deadly Lewisite gas—invisible, odorless, causing instant death if breathed, and with a spread fifty-five times greater than any previous known gas. A few hundred bombs well placed in a single night, with a favoring wind, would annihilate practically the entire population of any capital in Europe. Add to this the possibilities of war with disease germs.

5. Because the propaganda of modern warfare inevitably victimizes the people on both sides, obscures the truth and leads to the demoralization of both victor and vanquished, alike. In order to arouse whole masses of the people to the fury of going out and killing millions of their fellowmen, every generous trait or favorable fact about the foe must be suppressed. We must be told an unbroken stream of enemy atrocities; every unfavorable fact about ourselves and our allies must be silenced. If we are told the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, the common people will never go out to murder each other. We lashed ourselves to fury by telling each other that "the Huns are baby-killers." Of course we would never do that. Our bombs dropped on civil populations would never kill babies. Our gas would never harm women and children. Our hunger blockade would never touch a child. Yet what were the facts? Our successful Allied hunger blockade was killing a hundred thousand women and children and old men a year in Germany alone. A whole rising generation among the poor has been weakened by rickets, tuberculosis, undernourishment, and post-war diseases.

6. Because modern warfare, as conducted in the last war, is inhuman and unchristian. Jesus Christ introduced a new dynamic into life. He showed that life in its essence was not material but spiritual, that love is "Creation's final law," that it is more powerful than dynamite. He found the better way. Is humanity to descend to the brute, to the discredited half truth of Prussian militarism, in the sordid struggle for existence, or is it to rise by co-operation, by mutual aid, by self-sacrifice, to a higher plane of life?

CONCLUSION

Let us review now the problems that we have discussed. Think of the challenge of America's great past and of the ideals of Liberty, Justice, Democracy and Faith in God and man that lie at the foundation of our national life. Are we to forfeit these or strive for them still in the spirit of our forefathers? Think again of the challenge of our vast resources and of our potential moral leadership. Then review the present problems and perils that confront our nation: The political problem of selfish graft on the one hand and equally selfish profiteering on the other hand; serious industrial strife, with America leading the world in the number of strikes; the injustice of vast wealth for the few and poverty for the many; the problem of the open shop drive and "the denial of the right and opportunity to form effective organizations" on the part of labor; the twelve-hour day and seven-day week that still linger as a blot in several industries in America; the labor spy system; propaganda and the press; and the race problem still unsolved.

Let us place these problems in the light of our own great past and of our high ideals. Washington, in his farewell address, pleads for liberty and union and warns against the factions and divisions that threatened to rend and divide our simple commonwealth. Jefferson stands staunchly for "equal right for all and special privileges for none." Madison shows that "the most common source of factions has been the unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society . . . The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation." Lincoln pleads for a new birth of freedom for this nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." In his debates with Douglas he pleads for humanity "against the divine right of special privilege." Mr. Roosevelt said in 1906: "I feel that we shall ultimately have to consider the adoption of some such scheme as that of a progressive tax on fortunes beyond a certain amount, either given in life or devised or bequeathed after death." Woodrow Wilson in *The New Freedom* says, "The masters of the government

of the United States are the combined capitalists and manufacturers, an invisible empire set up above democracy."

Finally let us face these problems in the light of the great principles taught by Jesus Christ.

1. The infinite and therefore equal worth of every man as my brother before God as Father, whether employer or employee, American or foreigner, white, black, yellow or brown.

2. The brotherhood of all men in the light of God's Fatherhood.

3. The law of love, or the full sharing of life, fulfilled, not in the selfish pursuit of private profit, but in a life of service for the common weal.

Wherever men are really following Jesus' way of life and these principles are being really applied, they are pointing the way out of our difficulties, and the number who are applying them is on the increase.

Let us apply these three principles to each problem in turn and see if they furnish a solution—the only solution.

In support of the facts stated in the preceding pages concerning the problems and perils in America, we let the following report speak for itself.

Appendix

EXCERPTS FROM THE FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

(Reprinted from Senate Document 415, 64th Congress)

The plan of submitting none but undisputed facts in the final report of the commission has been faithfully adhered to.

LABOR CONDITIONS IN THE PRINCIPAL INDUSTRIES

The crux of the question is: Have the workers received a fair share of the enormous increase in wealth which has taken place in this country, during the period, as a result largely of their labors? The answer is emphatically, No! . . . p. 21

A large part of our industrial population are, as a result of the combination of low wages and unemployment, living in a condition of actual poverty. How large this proportion is can not be exactly determined, but it is certain that at least one-third and possibly one-half of the families of wage earners employed in manufacturing and mining earn in the course of the year less than enough to support them in anything like a comfortable and decent condition. The Immigration Commission, which reported to Congress in 1909, secured detailed information regarding the daily or weekly earnings of 619,595 employees of all classes in our basic manufacturing industries. p. 22.

It was found that the incomes of almost two-thirds of these families (64 per cent.) were less than \$750 per year and of almost one-third (31 per cent.) were less than \$500, the average for all being \$721. The average size of these families was 5.6 members . . . p. 22.

The terrible effects of such poverty may be outlined in a few paragraphs, but their far-reaching consequences could not be adequately shown in a volume. Children are the basis of the State . . . How do the children of American workers fare?

Through a study made in Johnstown, Pa., by the Federal Children's Bureau, it was shown that the babies of the poor died at three times the rate of those who were in fairly well-to-do families . . . One-

third of all the adult workmen reported by the Immigration Commission earned less than \$10 per week, even exclusive of time lost. On the showing of Johnstown these workmen may expect one out of four of their babies to die during the first year of life . . . The last of the family to go hungry are the children, yet statistics show that in six of our largest cities from 12 to 20 per cent. of the children are noticeably underfed and ill nourished . . . Only one-third of the children in our public schools complete the grammar school course, and less than 10 per cent. finish high school . . .

In the families of the workers 37 per cent. of the mothers are at work. Insanitary housing and working conditions, unemployment, wages inadequate to maintain a human standard of living, inevitably produce the crushed or distorted bodies and minds from which the army of crime is recruited. . . . p. 24.

CAUSE OF INDUSTRIAL UNREST

It is believed that Congress intended the inquiry to be directed to that unrest and dissatisfaction which grows out of the existence of intolerable industrial conditions and which, if unrelieved, will in the natural course of events rise into active revolt or, if forcibly suppressed, sink into sullen hatred.

The sources from which this unrest springs, group themselves almost without exception under four main sources which include all the others.

1. Unjust distribution of wealth and income.
2. Unemployment and denial of an opportunity to earn a living.
3. Denial of justice in the creation, in the adjudication, and in the administration of law.
4. Denial of the right and opportunity to form effective organizations. pp. 29 and 30.

1. UNJUST DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH AND INCOME

Between one-fourth and one-third of the male workers 18 years of age and over, in factories and mines, earn less than \$10 per week; from two-thirds to three-fourths earn less than \$15, and only about one-tenth earn more than \$20 a week . . . p. 31. (1915).

From two-thirds to three-fourths of the women workers in factories, stores and laundries, and in industrial occupations generally, work at wages of less than \$8 a week. Approximately one-fifth earn less than \$4 and nearly one-half earn less than \$6 a week. Six dollars a week—what does it mean to many? p. 31.

Massed in millions, at the other end of the social scale, are fortunes

of a size never before dreamed of, whose very owners do not know the extent nor, without the aid of an intelligent clerk, even the sources of their incomes. Incapable of being spent in any legitimate manner these fortunes are burdens, which can only be squandered, hoarded, put into so-called "benefactions" which, for the most part, constitute a menace to the State, or put back into the industrial machine to pile up ever-increasing mountains of gold. p. 32.

The ownership of wealth in the United States has become concentrated to a degree which is difficult to grasp.

The "rich," 2 per cent. of the people, own 60 per cent. of the wealth. The "middle class," 33 per cent. of the people, own 35 per cent. of the wealth. The "poor," 65 per cent. of the people, own 5 per cent. of the wealth. This means in brief that a little less than 2,000,000 people, who would make up a city smaller than Chicago, own 20 per cent. more of the Nation's wealth than all the other 90,000,000 . . . p. 33.

The largest private fortune in the United States, estimated at \$1,000,000,000, is equivalent to the aggregate wealth of 2,500,000 of those who are classed as "poor," who are shown in the studies cited to own on the average about \$400 each. They are frequently styled by our newspapers "monarchs of industry," and indeed occupy within our Republic a position almost exactly analogous to that of feudal lords. These heirs, owners only by virtue of the accident of birth, control the livelihood and have the power to dictate the happiness of more human beings than populated England in the Middle Ages. pp. 33 and 34.

2. UNEMPLOYMENT AND DENIAL OF OPPORTUNITY TO EARN A LIVING

As a prime cause of a burning resentment and a rising feeling of unrest among the workers, unemployment and the denial of an opportunity to earn a living is on a parity with the unjust distribution of wealth . . . In our great basic industries the workers are unemployed for an average of at least one-fifth of the year . . . pp. 35, 36.

This unemployment seems to rise from two great causes, although many others are contributory. First, the inequality of the distribution of income which leaves the great masses of the population, unable to purchase the products of industry which they create. The second principal cause lies in the denial of access to land and natural resources even when they are unused and unproductive. p. 36.

The unemployed have aptly been called "the shifting sands beneath the State." . . . Surely there is no condition which more immediately demands the attention of Congress than that of unemployment, which

is annually driving hundreds of thousands of otherwise productive citizens into poverty and bitter despair, sapping the very basis of our national efficiency, and germinating the seeds of revolution. p. 38.

3. DENIAL OF JUSTICE

There exists among the workers an almost universal conviction that they, both as individuals and as a class, are denied justice in the enactment, adjudication, and administration of law, that the very instruments of democracy are often used to oppress them and to place obstacles in the way of their movement toward economic, industrial, and political freedom and justice. If it be true that these statements represent the opinions of the mass of American workers, there is reason for grave concern, for there are 25,000,000 of them. pp. 38, 39.

First, with regard to the enactment of laws, it is charged that the workers have been unable to secure legislation to protect them against grievous wrongs, except after exhausting struggles against over-whelming odds and against insidious influences. p. 39.

The history of child-labor legislation shows that although agitation for the protection and education of children began during the early part of the nineteenth century, no adequate legislation was obtained until nearly the end of the century. Even the attempt to reduce the hours of children below 12 per day was bitterly contested. pp. 39, 40.

The railroads fought the laws providing for safety appliances. p. 40.

According to the best estimates, approximately 35,000 persons were killed last year in American industry, and at least one-half of these deaths were preventable. p. 43.

That the courts, including even the highest tribunal of the Nation, do allow their economic bias to influence them in holding laws unconstitutional is nowhere more clearly expressed than in the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Holmes in the case of *Lochner v. New York*.

Ex-President William H. Taft has said:

"We must make it so that the poor man will have as nearly as possible an equal opportunity in litigating as the rich man; and under present conditions, ashamed as we may be of it, this is not the fact." p. 47.

In Colorado martial law has been in effect ten times since 1894. Thousands have been held for long periods in "bull pens," hundreds have been forcibly deported from the State. p. 58.

4. DENIAL OF THE RIGHT OF ORGANIZATION

It has been pointed out with great force and logic that the struggle of labor for organization is not merely an attempt to secure an increased measure of the material comforts of life, but is a part of the age-long

struggle for liberty; that this struggle is sharpened by the pinch of hunger and the exhaustion of body and mind by long hours and improper working conditions; but that even if men were well fed they would still struggle to be free. p. 62.

Looking back over the industrial history of the last quarter century, the industrial disputes which have attracted the attention of the country and which have been accompanied by bloodshed and violence have been revolutions against industrial oppression, and not mere strikes for the improvement of working conditions. p. 67.

Thousands and tens of thousands of our people feel that they are deprived, under existing conditions in industry, of an opportunity to secure for themselves and their families a standard of living commensurate with the best ideals of manhood, womanhood, and childhood. They resent the fact that the existing system of the distribution of wealth creates at one end of our industrial scale a few multi-millionaires and at the other end thousands and tens of thousands of men, women, and children who are at all times in a situation where they are uncertain as to where their next meal will come from. Hungry, poorly clothed, and without the opportunities that a fully rounded life requires, they become filled with a sullen resentment that bodes no good for the future of our Republic. p. 163.

CHRISTIANITY AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

FACTS, PRINCIPLES, PROGRAMS

A Discussion Group Text-Book

Prepared by

Kirby Page, Chairman

Leslie Blanchard

Sherwood Eddy

Harrison S. Elliott

F. Ernest Johnson

David R. Porter

Florence Simms

Olive Van Horn

FOR THE
EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEE

OF THE
COMMISSION ON THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL SERVICE
OF THE

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA

Table of Contents

CHAP.

1. A Divided World
2. Poverty—Misfortune or Blessing?
3. Is Poverty a Serious Problem?
4. Do Great Fortunes Help or Hinder Social Progress?
5. Are Luxuries Antagonistic to Public Welfare?
6. Why Is There Not Enough to Go Around?
7. Does Modern Industry Help or Hinder the Full Development of Human Beings?
8. How Can Industry Be Made to Produce More Goods and Better People?
9. How Should Industry Be Controlled?
10. What Degree of Public Control of Industry will Best Promote the General Welfare?
11. How Rapidly Can a Christian Economic Order be Achieved?

INVALUABLE FOR PERSONAL STUDY
DISCUSSION GROUPS AND OPEN FORUMS

50 cents per copy

66th Thousand

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY, PUBLISHERS
244 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK

- No. 1—**INDUSTRIAL FACTS**, BY KIRBY PAGE.
Concrete data concerning industrial problems and proposed solutions.
32 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 2—**COLLECTIVE BARGAINING**, BY KIRBY PAGE.
An ethical evaluation of some phases of trade unionism and the open-shop movement.
32 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 3—**FELLOWSHIP**, BY BASIL MATHEWS and HARRY BISSEKER.
Preface by Sherwood Eddy.
A consideration of fellowship as a means of building the Christian social order.
32 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 4—**THE SWORD OR THE CROSS**, BY KIRBY PAGE.
A consideration of the ethics of war between nations and between classes; an analysis of Jesus' way of life.
64 Pages—15 Cents Net
(Regular Edition, \$1.20)
- No. 5—**THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION**, BY KIRBY PAGE.
An analysis of the social consequences of modern business policies.
32 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 6—**AMERICA: ITS PROBLEMS AND PERILS**, BY SHERWOOD EDDY.
An analysis of outstanding social, industrial, and racial problems.
32 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 7—**INCENTIVES IN MODERN LIFE**, BY KIRBY PAGE.
Are the motives of Jesus practicable in modern business and professional life?
32 Pages—10 Cents Net

Persons desiring quantities of these pamphlets for use in classes, discussion groups or open forums, or for distribution among their friends, may secure copies of Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 at the rate of 70 cents for ten copies or \$6.00 per hundred, postpaid, and copies of No. 4 in lots of five at 10 cents each, from Kirby Page, 311 Division Avenue, Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey.

INCENTIVES IN MODERN LIFE

ARE THE MOTIVES OF JESUS PRACTICABLE
IN MODERN BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LIFE?

BY

KIRBY PAGE

AUTHOR OF "THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION,"
"INDUSTRIAL FACTS," "COLLECTIVE BARGAINING," ETC.

The William Penn Lecture of 1922

NEW  YORK

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

Ten Cents Net.

COPYRIGHT, 1922,
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY



PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I: INTRODUCTION	5
II: TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THE INCENTIVES OF MODERN LIFE UNCHRISTIAN?.....	7
(1) THE DESIRE FOR A HIGHER STANDARD OF LIFE ENLIGHTENED SELF-INTEREST SOCIAL EFFECTS OF LUXURY	
(2) THE DESIRE FOR SUCCESS OR PERSONAL POWER	
(3) THE DESIRE TO SERVE	
(4) SUMMARY	
III: ARE THE MOTIVES OF JESUS PRACTICABLE IN MODERN BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LIFE?	15
(1) THE MOTIVES OF JESUS	
(2) HUMAN INSTINCTS	
(3) JESUS' WAY OF LIFE AND HUMAN NATURE	
(4) CHANGES IN THE PUBLIC ATTITUDE NEEDED	
(5) THE OUTCOME OF CONTINUED STRIFE	
(6) THE POWER OF PUBLIC OPINION	
(7) THE RESOURCES OF RELIGIOUS PEOPLE	
(8) SUMMARY	
IV: APPENDIX: THE ACQUISITIVE SOCIETY..	27

THE WILLIAM PENN LECTURE FOR 1922
WAS DELIVERED AT
THE RACE STREET MEETING HOUSE
FOR THE
YOUNG FRIENDS MOVEMENT
PHILADELPHIA
MAY 14TH

I: INTRODUCTION

A recent scientific bulletin estimates that three billion slaves would be required in the United States to do the work now being done by machines. It is further estimated that the mechanical power available is equivalent to fifty servants for every man, woman and child in this country. A huge turbine now produces energy equal to the labor of 400,000 strong men.

And yet this generation, which has fallen heir to incalculable energy and countless labor saving devices, is witnessing the spectacle of multitudes of people who are hungry and ill clad. Not only in the backward nations of the earth is this true, but across Europe there is appalling destitution. Even in our own land, the most favored of all the earth, large numbers of people are lacking in the necessities and minimum comforts of life. At a conservative estimate there are several million persons in the United States who are living in poverty or on the border of destitution.

An official commission of our Federal Government reported that "at least one-third and possibly one-half of the families of wage earners employed in manufacturing and mining earn in the course of the year less than enough to support them in anything like a comfortable and decent condition."

Another startling contrast is that between the claims and achievements of the churches. They claim to have a solution for all problems of human relations. For nineteen centuries they have been proclaiming a message of love, peace and brotherhood among men. And yet we are living in a world of strife. Everywhere men are

divided into warring camps. Nation is arrayed against nation, race against race, class against class. Bitterness and hatred are widespread.

How shall we account for the present state of affairs? Why are people hungry when the resources are at hand to supply their needs? Why are the churches so ineffective in overcoming strife and enmity?

II: TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THE INCENTIVES OF MODERN LIFE UNCHRISTIAN?

In a single address one cannot hope to deal with all of the complex issues involved. Only one phase of the situation can be considered. Much of the present turmoil and suffering is undoubtedly rooted in the incentives of modern life. We should, therefore, seek to analyze the dominant motives of men today. What are the chief influences which move men to action?

(1) THE DESIRE FOR A HIGHER STANDARD OF LIFE

This is a stimulus which is prevalent among all civilized people. The desire for wholesome food, serviceable clothing and pleasant surroundings is almost universal. One of the reasons why men exert themselves is that they may secure these things.

With a large proportion of the population in the United States the struggle is for the bare necessities and minimum comforts of life. Fear of hunger and destitution is ever present with large groups of people. With many other persons the struggle is for the comforts and minimum luxuries of life. And still others are striving for luxuries in abundance. This desire to raise one's standard of life is one of the impelling motives in modern life. Higher wages and larger profits are desired primarily as a means to this end. Modern industry rests upon the profit system. The appeal to self-interest is dominant. Financial reward is depended upon to secure maximum activity. Each person is supposed to make as large profits as he can, so long as he follows the accepted rules.

ENLIGHTENED SELF-INTEREST

For more than a century "enlightened self-interest," as a consciously accepted doctrine, has prevailed. It has been taken for granted by most Anglo-Saxon people that the welfare of all, can best be served by each person seeking his own good. Edmund Burke once said that we should be filled "with thankfulness to the benign and wise Disposer of all things, who obliges men, whether they will or not, in pursuing their own selfish interests, to connect the general good with their own individual successes." Archbishop Whately expresses a similar opinion: "It is curious to observe how through the wise and beneficent arrangement of Providence, men thus do the greatest service to the public when they are thinking of nothing but their own gain."

The opinion is still widely prevalent that modern industry cannot exist on any other basis than individual selfishness. A prominent banker recently said: "I know of no way of making any human being give \$50,000 worth of service for \$1,500 in pay. Nobody would care much about working hard enough to earn more than \$10,000 a year just to see someone else get it."

In our protest against "profiteering" we have usually failed to realize how deeply engrained the profit motive is in modern life. Many persons are enraged at the few skilled workers who have successfully demanded \$15 per day. Just now the wrath of the public is directed against coal miners and operators. It seems rather strange that we should find fault with a few workers and employers for doing the very thing which is most characteristic of modern business and industry.

The man who purchases a corner lot for \$5,000 and two years later sells it for \$12,000 is credited with good judgment. The broker who buys at 89 and sells for 148 is congratulated by his friends. The name of the "home-run king", whose salary runs into five figures, is a household word throughout the land. The prize fighter who receives \$350,000 for a few well directed blows is acclaimed as a national hero. The movie star who draws a salary of a million dollars a year is the idol

of the fans. The farmer whose potato patch is transformed into an oil well and whose old buggy is exchanged for a Rolls Royce, becomes an object of admiration and envy on the part of his neighbors. And so it goes through modern life. The possessive instincts, the desire to own and to display are dominant.

Is the desire for more possessions unchristian? This question cannot be answered until we discover the consequences of having more possessions: upon ourselves and upon others. Possessions are the basis of culture. They furnish security and leisure. Want and the fear of want are deadly foes of the good life. The higher values are endangered when one is compelled to spend all of his time and energy in the struggle for mere existence. Family life, especially, is menaced by poverty. Certainly we would not say that the struggle of a man for possessions enough to enable him to support his family in modest comfort and security is unchristian. The unchristian thing in this connection is the set of circumstances which make this comfort and security impossible for many families.

What shall we say concerning the desire for more than the minimum comforts of life? Is such a desire unchristian? What are the effects of an annual income of \$5,000 upon a family? There seems to be no doubt that most families could use an income of this amount to good advantage and would be enabled to live more abundantly as a result. The question, however, cannot be settled on this basis alone. We must also consider whether or not this sum is more than our share of the national income.

What shall we say concerning the larger incomes? Is the desire for great wealth unchristian? What are the consequences? For some persons great wealth means the opportunity for higher culture, for others it means a chance for riotous living. Great possessions bring larger opportunities and more dangers. At this point it will be recalled that Jesus warned his hearers of the perils of great riches and spoke of the difficulty with which a rich man can enter the Kingdom of God.

Are great fortunes a good thing for society? Do they

promote the public welfare? There is no doubt that large gifts to worthy causes, made possible by great fortunes, have done an immense amount of good. In almost every community there are evidences of these generous gifts. In the realms of public health, education, art and religion, the philanthropy of the rich has been an important factor.

On the other hand, we must take into account the menace of excessive concentration of wealth and power. While great fortunes make possible generous gifts, they also make possible a high degree of control in education, civic affairs and political life, and of public opinion. Great fortunes in the hands of selfish people do an immense amount of damage to the public welfare.

THE SOCIAL EFFECTS OF LUXURY

The point upon which we need to do the clearest thinking, however, is with regard to the social effects of luxuries. Does the production and consumption of luxuries promote the common good? There is a widespread belief that the production of luxuries "makes work" and "puts money in circulation," and is, therefore, a good thing for everybody. Is this idea supported by the facts in the case?

Let us consider an extreme instance, that of a wealthy man who decides to build a two-million-dollar mansion. He selects one of the most desirable plots in the city, fronting on the park. Plans are drawn up calling for fifty rooms, some of which are as large as four or five ordinary apartments; elaborate decorations; furnishings gathered from the corners of the earth; an immense pipe organ; swimming pool and a score of bath rooms, sunken gardens and a large hot-house; and a library of several thousand volumes. Hundreds of workers are employed for a year. After completion the building is used by one family, with occasional guests, for less than half the year. The public is rigorously excluded. Scores of servants are employed and the upkeep of the place costs upward of a hundred thousand dollars a year.

Has the expenditure of two million dollars upon this mansion been a good thing or a bad thing for society?

It has "made work" for hundreds of persons. It has put an immense amount of money in circulation. From the standpoint of society, however, it has done three other things: It has wasted human labor, it has wasted materials, it has wasted capital. The same workers, the same materials and the same capital might have been used in the erection of several hundred badly needed apartments. As many workers could have been employed and as much money put in circulation, and in the end several hundred times as many people would have been housed.

This is an extreme illustration and the number of cases of this sort is limited. But it does bring out the social consequences of the production of luxuries. The fact which should be stamped indelibly upon our minds is this: *Luxuries divert labor, materials and capital into channels which are of little social value, and therefore, raise the price of the necessities of life, thus increasing the struggle of the poor.* Upon this point economists are generally agreed.

In the light of this indisputable fact, the question should be raised: Is a Christian justified in living in luxury, at the expense of an intensified struggle on the part of the poor for the bare necessities of life? Is a Christian justified in even spending the amount necessary for his own fullest cultural development, at the expense of the less fortunate? What are the effects upon brotherhood of living in luxury while many are in want?

Still another factor needs to be considered, viz., the appalling human need in other parts of the world. The obligation which rests upon a follower of Jesus knows no boundaries of race or nation. The true Christian in America cannot be unmindful of the tragic need in the Orient, the Near East, or Europe. The expenditure of even a few dollars in the needier places of the earth means the saving of human lives, each of which is of inestimable worth in the sight of God. Are any of us justified in living in luxury in a hungry world?

At what point does the desire for personal possessions become unchristian? This question demands clear thinking, resolute decision and courageous action.

(2) THE DESIRE FOR SUCCESS OR PERSONAL POWER

A second major incentive in modern life is the *desire to succeed*, to achieve a given end. This motive operates powerfully with many persons who have no desire for great possessions. Moreover it is often the basis of the desire for great possessions, since possessions have now become a badge of success.

Mr. Charles M. Schwab, President of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, once said: "When the achievements of my life have been completed and my obituary is being written, if I can leave as a monument a long line of smoke stacks and boiler works and rolling mills and establishments, I shall be prouder than of the grandest monument men might erect in my memory. The men in business in the United States are not working for money alone. The chief pride of American character is successful accomplishment. It may be measured by the dollars that go into his coffers, but the real throb and thrill of pleasure that comes to his mind is one of successful accomplishment."

The attitude of many business and professional men has been described by a prominent sociologist in these words: "American men make money as American boys play marbles in spring, baseball in summer, and football in autumn. The rich man toiling for more, often is simply trying to run up a high score at the national game."

The desire for personal power is closely bound up with the desire to succeed. Many men are thrilled at their ability to manipulate things, while some find their greatest joy in directing other people. The desire for the success which brings recognition and personal power is an important factor in modern life.

Is the desire for success and personal power unchristian? It depends upon the kind of success desired and the use to which power is put. None of us would say that it is unchristian to desire personal power as a means of helping other people. Unfortunately, power is more often desired for selfish reasons. Many persons desire power as a

means of satisfying selfish ambitions or of gratifying personal pride.

The wife of Zebedee once asked Jesus to grant to her sons the privilege of occupying the chief places of honor in his kingdom. In reply Jesus said to his disciples: "Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you: but whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant, even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and give his life a ransom for many."

(3) THE DESIRE TO SERVE

A third major incentive in modern life is *the desire to serve*, to be of use in the world. This should not be confused with a popular meaning of "service" in business today. The word is often used as meaning courtesy, thoughtfulness, fair dealing and efficiency—for the sake of higher profits. Many persons believe in "service" because it pays.

There are, however, many persons in modern life whose chief stimulus is the genuine desire to help other folks and to have a share in building a better world. These persons are found in all walks of life—as merchants, teachers, lawyers, artists, preachers, scientists, surgeons, carpenters, bankers, farmers, and miners.

(4) SUMMARY

The evidence seems to indicate that the group whose chief motive is that of unselfish service is greatly outnumbered by those who are spurred to action by the desire for possessions or personal power. It seems unquestionable that of the total number of business and professional men in the United States, a large majority are motivated chiefly by the desire for possessions or for the power which accompanies success. Self-interest, enlightened or unenlightened, is still dominant in the lives of most people.

A well known writer has described what he believed to be the prevailing spirit of the times in these words:

"Look where you will, it is the spirit of I Myself which is paramount. Life exists for Me: all the dim aeons behind have toiled to produce Me: This brief moment in the eternal duration of time is only an opportunity for My pleasure and My ease. I care not a jot for the ages ahead and the sons of men who shall inhabit the earth when I am dust beneath their feet. Give Me My Rights. Stand clear of My way. I want and I will have."

III: ARE THE MOTIVES OF JESUS PRACTICABLE IN MODERN BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LIFE?

(1) THE MOTIVES OF JESUS

The dominant motive of Jesus was service. "For the Son of Man himself has not come to be served but to serve." "For the Son of Man has come to seek and save the lost." "I have come that they may have life and have it the full." "And for their sake I consecrate myself that they may be consecrated by the truth." Love was the supreme characteristic of his life. He went about doing good, healing the sick, feeding the hungry, strengthening the tempted, lifting up the fallen, comforting the broken hearted, calling men into companionship with the Father. His manner of life and his message were so unacceptable to the ecclesiastical authorities of his day that in the end he was hanged upon a cross. And yet, in the anguish of those last moments, he cried out, "Father, forgive them, they do not know what they are doing."

Is Jesus' way of life practicable for men in this generation? Are men so constituted that it is hopeless to expect them to be dominated by his motives?

(2) HUMAN INSTINCTS

There is general agreement among psychologists today that the actions of human beings are motivated primarily by instincts, innate tendencies or psychical dispositions. "The behavior of man in the family," says Professor Thorndike, "in business, in the state, in religion, and in every other affair of life, is rooted in his unlearned original equipment of instincts and capacities." Are

these instincts or tendencies of such a nature as to make the motives of Jesus impracticable for most men?

Among the strongest instincts of man are those of sex, acquisition, anger, pugnacity and mastery. These instincts are often expressed in a manner which is anti-social, but it by no means follows that they are inherently anti-social. They are frequently expressed in ways which are of great social value. Moreover, there are other human instincts which most readily express themselves through social channels. Psychologists are generally agreed that the following tendencies are innate in human nature:

(1) *The instinct of creation or workmanship.* It is natural for men to make things. This is as truly a part of the nature of man as the desire for possessions. William James has said: "Constructiveness is a genuine and irresistible instinct in man as in the bee or beaver." If this tendency is not manifest in men today it is because of the artificial and adverse conditions under which they live.

(2) *The gregarious instinct and sensitiveness to approval and disapproval.* It is natural for men to desire to be together. This is one of the reasons for the growth of cities and the decline of rural communities. Not only do men like to be together, they are very sensitive to the opinion of the rest of the group. Ostracism is one of the severest penalties which can come to any man. Man cannot be happy by himself. A prominent sociologist has expressed the opinion that the social motive is "the strongest that sways us, even stronger in normal life than hunger or sex."

(3) *The instinct of self-respect.* It is natural for men to evaluate their own conduct and to desire to reach a standard which they have erected. Men delight in their own skill, strength, or righteousness. The desire for self-approval operates powerfully in all normal persons.

(4) *The instinct of parental love and self-sacrifice.* The love of parents for their children and the willingness to sacrifice for them is universal. Closely related is the tendency to be kind and considerate of others. Mutual aid is natural to human beings, as it is to the higher

animals. The subordination of selfish desires to the higher good of the group is characteristic of individuals in ascending civilization. "The power of sacrifice and renunciation," says Benjamin Kidd, "is the first and last word in the kind of efficiency which is deepening in the social era of the race. The progress of humanity, has, therefore, over and above every other feature this meaning. It is the epic of the vast, tragic, ennobling, immortalizing, all-conquering ethic of Renunciation."

(3) JESUS' WAY OF LIFE AND HUMAN NATURE

The reason for examining human instincts at this point is that such a study shows that human nature is not inevitably antagonistic to Jesus' way of life. The motives which prompted him to action are deeply ingrained in human nature and are altogether natural to normal persons.

The best proof of this statement is found in the fact that throughout the centuries many persons have applied his motives in all relationships of life. This has been true not only of Christian missionaries and ministers, but also of persons in many other vocations. There have been conspicuous illustrations of men of science who were motivated by a passion for truth and the desire to be of service to mankind, even though this devotion cost them their lives. The glorious record of these men is a repudiation of the idea that the possessive instincts are always dominant.

It seems strange that there should be any lingering doubts as to the power of self-sacrifice latent in all normal human beings, after the world-wide demonstration during the Great War. One does not need to be a believer in the righteousness or efficacy of war as a method, to recognize the fact that during the war there was a vast sacrificial outpouring of treasure and blood. In all of the belligerent nations the instincts of possession were subordinated to the instincts of service and self-giving. A stupendous volume of self-sacrifice was released and millions of men—Americans, Germans, Englishmen, Frenchmen, Austrians and Italians—gladly laid down their lives in what they believed to be a holy cause.

The experiences of war-time should convince us beyond doubt that *self-sacrifice is just as natural as any other of man's instincts and under appropriate circumstances is absolutely supreme in the average person.* The desire for possessions, craving for mastery, love of family, are ultimately less powerful than sacrificial devotion to a great cause.

At bottom there is no essential difference in the make-up of missionaries, scientists, soldiers and the common people in all walks of life. All are members of one species, children of one Father. All have the same instincts and innate tendencies. Love is just as natural as hate, mutual aid as antagonism, self-sacrifice as self-assertion. None of the motives of Jesus are unnatural for the normal person.

In this connection, Professor John Dewey says: "If there are difficulties in the way of social alteration—as there certainly are—they do not lie in an original aversion of human nature to serviceable action," but rather in the conditions under which men live. Professor Irving Fisher names seven major instincts, as follows: self-preservation, self-expression, self-respect, loyalty, home-making, play, worship. He then says: "Of the seven mentioned, only the instinct of self-preservation is even fairly well satisfied by the majority of workers. We thrum too continuously on the one string. Human nature is a harp of many strings. We must use the rest of the octave."

The task before us, then, is not the changing of human nature, but the creation of situations in which new sets of human instincts may more easily find expression. To this end, public opinion needs to be changed with regard to several vital points. Since individual action is profoundly affected by social approval and disapproval, this is a natural place to begin. It would seem that the public attitude needs to be changed with regard to three fundamental points in modern industry.

(4) CHANGES IN THE PUBLIC ATTITUDE NEEDED

First, with regard to the relative merits of possession and creation. In the United States it seems unquestion-

able that possession or ownership has generally been regarded much more highly than the element of creation or construction. The man who *has* things is usually more highly honored than the man who *does* things. Of course, there are exceptions to the rule, but in the average community the man with the greatest possessions is usually regarded as "the biggest man in town." The millionaire is usually more admired and envied than the teacher or preacher, although the degree of his service for his fellows may be negligible as compared with that of many other citizens. Therefore, the ideal held most vividly before the average young person is the desire to become rich.

This is not a high ideal and its pursuit is responsible for much of the strife and misery in the world today. The ideal which should constantly be held before the youth of the land is that of service, creation, construction, for the common good. Chief honors should go to those who are most successful in this realm and only the lesser honors to those who succeed in accumulating goods for their own selfish enjoyment. Upon the relative merits of creating and owning, public opinion should speak in clarion tones.

Second, there is need for a change in public opinion with regard to the purpose of engaging in business or industry. It is now too often assumed that young people should enter business or industry primarily as a means of making money. This is a low conception of business and places it on a different level than the ministry or certain other professions. No one would suggest that a young man should enter the ministry or the teaching profession primarily because it offers an opportunity to make money.

We need a new attitude toward industry. The chief purpose of industry is not to help men get rich; its chief purpose is to produce goods and services which are needed by the community. The idea that men should engage in business or industry primarily to make money is responsible for much of the present disorder and inefficiency.

Third, we need a new attitude toward competition

and co-operation. Throughout American history, competition has been glorified and regarded as the basis of our national prosperity. There is much to be said for this point of view. Competition has tended to develop self-reliance and independence of spirit and has contributed to social progress. It is probable, however, that the extent of this contribution has been highly exaggerated in the popular mind.

It seems time to challenge the sanctity of competition and to point out its real nature. A distinction should be made between modern competition in business and rivalry in games or artistic pursuits. The value of such rivalry is generally recognized. Commercial competition as a rule is not friendly rivalry and good sportsmanship. The primary purpose of commercial competition is to gain personal power or a larger share of the common store of goods and services. Its result usually is strife and bitterness and it is the basis of the intense struggle now being waged in industry, where employer is arrayed against employer, workman against workman, employers against workmen, and consumers against both employers and workmen.

It should be recognized that conditions in the United States have changed during the past three decades and that competition is less and less efficient. So long as land was cheap and plentiful and so long as industry was conducted in small units, competition was more effective and less destructive of human relations. Now that our population has greatly increased and that immense tracts of land are being monopolized by a few holders, with the consequence that land is increasingly expensive and difficult to secure by the average man, and since industry is increasingly being concentrated in great units, with fewer men owning their own tools, the results of competition are more and more disastrous.

Harmony and efficiency in industry depend upon co-operation. The need of the hour is for public opinion which will strongly disapprove selfish competition and approve co-operation for the common good. The times demand a multitude of intensive experiments in co-operation in all phases of industry. Public opinion should

bestow its blessings upon all genuine efforts to substitute the principle of co-operation for that of competition. Experiments in co-operative distribution, co-operative marketing, co-operative production and co-operative banking should be encouraged.

(5) THE OUTCOME OF CONTINUED STRIFE

The people of this generation will do well to pause and consider the probable outcome of the present strife if unchecked. It should be remembered that the peoples of the earth are being drawn into closer and closer contacts. Trade knows no boundaries and international competition is growing keener. The points of friction are multiplying and the danger zones are widening.

Within the different nations the situation is critical. The lines between employers and workers are being drawn more sharply. Bitterness in industrial relations is increasing. The belligerent parties in the struggle are growing in power. There is an increasing concentration of wealth and control and employers' associations are growing in power. Organized labor is also gaining strength. Industrial struggles are more and more disastrous to public welfare. Continued emphasis upon self-interest and competition can have no other end than intensified warfare in industry. A recent writer has said: "We must discover new motives or life will become sordid and desolate, and society a trough, a sty, and a slaughter pen." Unless new motives are made dominant, it is altogether probable that the nations will be plunged into further wars. And further wars on a wide scale will undoubtedly threaten the very existence of modern civilization. We should not allow ourselves to forget that several civilizations have perished from the earth in the course of human history.

The churches should realize the extent of their stake in the industrial struggle. The more intense this struggle becomes, the less influence they will have in any sphere of life. The churches in the United States should take warning from what is happening in England and on the Continent. There seems to be no doubt that the breach between the churches and the great masses of working

people is widening. In many European countries the churches are held in contempt by most workers, and have little influence in the community. The industrial struggle is not solely responsible for this condition, but it is a major factor.

Strife and warfare in industry undermine the very foundations upon which the churches rest. It is mockery to speak of brotherhood being a reality when men in industry are tearing at each other's vitals. The sooner the churches realize that their future usefulness depends upon a lessening of the industrial conflict, and the sooner they throw the full weight of their influence against self-interest and selfish competition and in favor of friendly co-operation for the public welfare, the better it will be for the world.

(6) POWER OF PUBLIC OPINION

A society which awards its honors on a basis of service, rather than on grounds of ownership; in which industry is based on production for social use, rather than for individual profit; and in which the method is that of co-operation for the common good, rather than selfish competition for private gain; will be one in which the chief barriers to harmony and efficiency in industry have been removed. A strong public expression on these three points would make possible an immense stride forward.

The power of public approval or disapproval is very great. If selfish competition for the sake of accumulating goods for personal enjoyment should be placed under the ban of public disapproval, and unselfish co-operation for the common good should receive the unqualified endorsement of public opinion, an atmosphere would be created in which the anti-social instincts would be sub-ordinated and the more social tendencies released. It has been said by Professor E. C. Hayes that "society has incalculable power to suppress what it sufficiently condemns and to promote what it sufficiently appreciates. . . . Society can create a situation in which wickedness will in general be imbecility."

In this connection, Benjamin Kidd said: "Every

institution in civilization is in fore-grips with a new kind of knowledge, the control of which will become a matter of life and death to it. It is clearly in evidence that the science of creating and transmitting public opinion under the influence of collective emotion is about to become the principal science of civilization, to the mastery of which all governments and all powerful interests will in the future address themselves with every resource at their command."

Religious people have a duty and an opportunity at this point. In the light of the teaching and example of Jesus it would seem that the churches should have a clear message with regard to the three points under consideration. Jesus uttered a warning against the desire for great possessions in these words: "Take heed, and keep yourselves from all covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." He warned his hearers against fruitless worry over food and raiment. In a parable he pictured the doom of a rich man who was intent only upon his own comfort and pleasure. The verdict of Jesus is emphatic that the possession of goods is of no importance as compared with creation, construction or service for the common good.

As to the relative merits of selfish competition and co-operation for the common good, it would seem that the teaching of Jesus is clear. Is selfish competition in accord with his teaching concerning the supremacy of love, goodwill and brotherhood? Is not co-operation the channel through which these attitudes most easily find expression?

In the light of this clear teaching, it would seem that the churches should be proclaiming with vigor the message that the purpose of industry is to produce goods which are needed, rather than to make possible the accumulation of private wealth, and that the method should be that of friendly co-operation rather than selfish competition.

Is it not high time that the title "Christian" be withdrawn from those persons who are motivated primarily by the selfish desire for great possessions or personal

power and whose ruthless competition and disregard of the welfare of competitors and the public is an utter denial of brotherhood—no matter how large their benevolent gifts and public benefactions may be? Should not the approval of the churches be reserved for those persons who, in the spirit of Jesus, are unselfishly co-operating with their fellows in serving the common good? Is not this the least that should be expected of the churches? *Strife and warfare are inevitable in a world which enthrones selfish competition.* It is futile to expect peace and harmony in industry so long as selfish competition receives the blessing of public opinion.

(7) THE RESOURCES OF RELIGIOUS PEOPLE

Religious people in the United States have the power to change the public attitude toward the three fundamental points under consideration. They have enormous resources at their disposal. There are over forty million communicants of the various churches. These persons acknowledge the supremacy of Jesus' way of life and are at least nominally committed to his leadership. Many of them are troubled over the strife and misery of this day and are increasingly sensitive to the evils of modern industry. For the most part their intentions are good. They will to do the right thing. There are more than one hundred thousand ministers in charge of congregations. There are hundreds of thousands of teachers in Sunday Schools and millions of pupils. The weekly circulation of the religious press runs into the millions. The latent power of the religious forces in America to influence public opinion is incalculable.

Among the resources of Christian people is a strong belief in the presence and co-operation of the Holy Spirit. The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is a living God, who has been seeking through the ages to win men to his way of life and to establish His Kingdom upon earth. The realization of His presence and help in the task of making modern life conform to His will is an enormous inspiration to Christians and greatly increases their enthusiasm, courage and faith. One of the tragedies of these days is the fact that so many Christians are

seemingly unaware of the presence of God and make so little effort to co-operate with Him in building a better world.

The historian Lecky, in speaking of the influence of John Wesley and his followers, said: "England escaped the horrors of the French Revolution largely through the vehement religious enthusiasm which was at that very time passing through the middle and lower classes of people." It is possible that history may repeat itself in America during the next few decades and that in this land an awakening in the churches may prevent the worst excesses of the class-war which is even now sweeping over parts of Europe.

(8) SUMMARY

Let us again raise the question: Are the motives of Jesus practicable in modern business and professional life? It has been pointed out that psychologists are agreed that the instincts of creation, sensitiveness to social approval and disapproval, self-respect, parental love and self-sacrifice, are active in all normal persons. The vast release of latent self-sacrifice during the war is sufficient proof of this fact. The self-denial and unselfish service of Jesus are not contrary to human nature. The task before us is not the changing of human nature but the creation of situations in which the more social tendencies may more easily be given expression.

To this end, changes are needed in public opinion with regard to the relative merits of ownership versus service, as to whether the basis of industry is production for personal profit or for social use, as to whether selfish competition is better than friendly co-operation.

If changes in the public attitude on these three points do not take place, it seems certain that we shall have continued strife in industry and warfare between nations and that civilization itself will be seriously menaced. The churches have a great stake in the industrial struggle. They also have enormous latent power to form public opinion and to create situations in which the more social instincts will find expression.

The task before us is not an impossible one. The motives of Jesus are natural to man at his best and can be applied in modern business and professional life. They must be applied if life is to be made tolerable for mankind. The difficulties in the way of their application are stupendous. Courage of a high order is demanded. And yet in other realms men are not dismayed by obstacles. Behind the desk of one of the great industrial leaders of the nation is a small electric sign which he illuminates at psychological moments. It reads: CAN'T MUST BE OVERCOME.

This is the attitude pre-eminent for the Christian with regard to the obstacles which block the way to the application of the motives of Jesus in modern business and professional life. Can't *must* be overcome.

APPENDIX

Brief Extracts from

THE ACQUISITIVE SOCIETY¹

By R. H. Tawney

Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford

A society which aimed at making the acquisition of wealth contingent upon the discharge of social obligations, which sought to proportion remuneration to service and denied it to those by whom no service was performed, which inquired first not what men possess but what they can make or create or achieve, might be called a Functional Society, because in such a society the main subject of social emphasis would be the performance of functions. But such a society does not exist, even as a remote ideal, in the modern world, though something like it has hung, an unrealized theory, before men's minds in the past. Modern societies aim at protecting economic rights, while leaving economic functions, except in moments of abnormal emergency, to fulfill themselves. . . . ²⁸ Such societies may be called Acquisitive Societies, because their whole tendency and interest and preoccupation is to promote the acquisition of wealth. ²⁹

If society is to be healthy, men must regard themselves not as the owners of rights, but as trustees for the discharge of functions and the instruments of a social purpose. ⁵¹

The application to property and industry of the principle of function is compatible with several different types of social organization. . . . The essential

¹ Published by Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 188 pages, \$1.50. This is one of the great books of recent years and should be in the library of every student of social problems.

thing is that men should fix their minds upon the idea of purpose, and give that idea pre-eminence over all subsidiary issues.⁸⁴

The application to industry of the principle of purpose is simple, however difficult it may be to give effect to it. It is to turn it into a Profession. A Profession may be defined most simply as a trade which is organized, incompletely, no doubt, but genuinely, for the performance of function. It is not simply a collection of individuals who get a living for themselves by the same kind of work. Nor is it merely a group which is organized exclusively for the economic protection of its members, though that is normally among its purposes. It is a body of men who carry on their work in accordance with rules designed to enforce certain standards both for the better protection of its members and for the better service of the public. The standards which it maintains may be high or low: all professions have some rules which protect the interest of the community and others which are an imposition on it. Its essence is that it assumes certain responsibilities for the competence of its members or the quality of its wares, and that it deliberately prohibits certain kinds of conduct on the ground that, though they may be profitable to the individual, they are calculated to bring into disrepute the organization to which he belongs.⁹²

The difference between industry as it exists today and a profession is, then, simple and unmistakable. The essence of the former is that its only criterion is the financial return which it offers to its shareholders. The essence of the latter, is that, though men enter it for the sake of livelihood, the measure of their success is the service which they perform, not the gains which they amass. They may, as in the case of a successful doctor, grow rich; but the meaning of their profession, both for themselves and for the public, is not that they make money but that they make health, or safety, or knowledge, or good government or good law. They depend on it for their income, but they do not consider that any conduct which increases their income is on that account good. And while a boot-manufacturer who retires with

half a million is counted to have achieved success, whether the boots which he made were of leather or brown paper, a civil servant who did the same would be impeached. So, if they are doctors, they recognize that there are certain kinds of conduct which cannot be practised, however large the fee offered for them, because they are unprofessional; if scholars and teachers, that it is wrong to make money by deliberately deceiving the public, as is done by makers of patent medicines, however much the public may clamor to be deceived; if judges or public servants, that they must not increase their incomes by selling justice for money; if soldiers, that the service comes first, and their private inclinations, even the reasonable preference of life to death, second. Every country has its traitors, every army its deserters, and every profession its blacklegs. To idealize the professional spirit would be very absurd; it has its sordid side, and, if it is to be fostered in industry, safeguards will be needed to check its excesses. But there is all the difference between maintaining a standard which is occasionally abandoned, and affirming as the central truth of existence that there is no standard to maintain. The meaning of a profession is that it makes the traitors the exception, not as they are in industry, the rule.⁹⁴

If industry is to be organized as a profession, two changes are requisite, one negative and one positive. The first, is that it should cease to be conducted by the agents of property-owners for the advantage of property-owners, and should be carried on, instead, for the service of the public. The second, is that, subject to rigorous public supervision, the responsibility for the maintenance of the service should rest upon the shoulders of those, from organizer and scientist to laborer, by whom, in effect, the work is conducted.⁹⁶

Such a change in the character of ownership would have three advantages. It would abolish the government of industry by property. It would end the payment of profits to functionless shareholders by turning them into creditors paid a fixed rate of interest. It would lay the only possible foundations for industrial peace by making it possible to convert industry into a profession

carried on by all grades of workers for the service of the public, not for the gain of those who own capital.¹⁰⁶

Either the principle of industry is that of function, in which case slack work is only less immoral than no work at all; or it is that of grab, in which case there is no morality in the matter. But it cannot be both. And it is useless either for property-owners or for Governments to lament the mote in the eye of the trade unions as long as, by insisting on the maintenance of functionless property, they decline to remove the beam in their own.¹³³

During the greater part of the nineteenth century industry was driven by two forces, hunger and fear, and the employer commanded them both. He could grant or withhold employment as he pleased. If men revolted against his terms he could dismiss them, and if they were dismissed what confronted them was starvation or the workhouse. Authority was centralized; its instruments were passive; the one thing which they dreaded was unemployment. . . . That system might be lauded as efficient or denounced as inhuman. But, at least, as its admirers were never tired of pointing out, it worked. And, like the Prussian State, which alike in its virtues and deficiencies it not a little resembled, as long as it worked it survived denunciations of its methods, as a strong man will throw off a disease. But today it is ceasing to have even the qualities of its defects. It is ceasing to be efficient. It no longer secures the ever-increasing output of wealth which it offered in its golden prime, and which enabled it to silence criticism by an imposing spectacle of material success. Though it still works, it works unevenly, amid constant friction and jolts and stoppages, without the confidence of the public and without full confidence even in itself, a tyrant who must intrigue and cajole where formerly he commanded, a goaler who, if not yet deprived of whip, dare only administer moderate chastisement, and who, though he still protests that he alone can keep the treadmill moving and get the corn ground, is compelled to surrender so much of his authority as to make it questionable whether he is worth his keep.¹⁴⁰

The burden of our civilization is not merely, as many suppose, that the product of industry is ill-distributed, or its conduct tyrannical, or its operation interrupted by embittered disagreements. It is that industry itself has come to hold a position of exclusive predominance among human interests, which no single interest, and least of all the provision of the material means of existence, is fit to occupy. Like a hypochondriac who is so absorbed in the processes of his own digestion that he goes to his grave before he has begun to live, industrialized communities neglect the very objects for which it is worth while to acquire riches in their feverish preoccupation with the means by which riches can be acquired.¹⁸³

That obsession by economic issues is as local and transitory as it is repulsive and disturbing. To future generations it will appear as pitiable as the obsession of the seventeenth century by religious quarrels appears today; indeed, it is less rational, since the object with which it is concerned is less important. And it is a poison which inflames every wound and turns each trivial scratch into a malignant ulcer. Society will not solve the particular problems of industry which afflict it, until that poison is expelled, and it has learned to see industry itself in the right perspective. If it is to do that, it must rearrange its scale of values. It must regard economic interests as one element in life, not as the whole of life. It must persuade its members to renounce the opportunity of gains which accrue without any corresponding service, because the struggle for them keeps the whole community in a fever. It must so organize industry that the instrumental character of economic activity is emphasized by its subordination to the social purposes for which it is carried on.¹⁸⁴

**THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.**

44-2643

71st Thousand

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY, PUBLISHERS
244 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK

- No. 1—INDUSTRIAL FACTS, BY KIRBY PAGE.
Concrete data concerning industrial problems and proposed solutions.
22 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 2—COLLECTIVE BARGAINING, BY KIRBY PAGE
An ethical evaluation of some phases of trade unionism and the open-shop movement.
32 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 3—FELLOWSHIP, BY BASIL MATHEWS AND HARRY BISSEKER.
Preface by Sherwood Eddy.
A consideration of fellowship as a means of building the Christian social order.
32 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 4—THE SWORD OR THE CROSS, BY KIRBY PAGE.
A consideration of the ethics of war between nations and between classes; an analysis of Jesus' way of life.
64 Pages—15 Cents Net
(Regular Edition, \$1.20)
- No. 5—THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION, BY KIRBY PAGE.
Reprint from *The Atlantic Monthly*, May 1922.
An analysis of the social consequences of modern business policies.
32 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 6—AMERICA: ITS PROBLEMS AND PERILS, BY SHERWOOD EDDY.
An analysis of outstanding social, industrial, and racial problems.
32 Pages—10 Cents Net
- No. 7—INCENTIVES IN MODERN LIFE, BY KIRBY PAGE.
Are the motives of Jesus practicable in modern business and professional life?
32 Pages—10 Cents Net

Persons desiring quantities of these pamphlets for use in classes, discussion groups or open forums, or for distribution among their friends, may secure copies of Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 at the rate of 70 cents for ten copies or \$6.00 per hundred, postpaid, and copies of No. 4 in lots of five at 10 cents each, from Kirby Page, 311 Division Avenue, Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey.

BR Page, Kirby, 1890-1957.
115 Industrial facts; concrete data concerning
E3 industrial problems, and proposed solutions.
C54 New York, G.H. Doran [c1921]
no.1-7 iii, 32p. 21cm. (Christianity and industry,
no.1)

1. Labor and laboring classes--Addresses,
essays, lectures. I. Title. II. Series.

442643

CCSC/mmb

